

# THE STANDARD

NO. 77-VOL. III, NO.

104 Dr. Walter  
McDowell 76  
179 W 74th St

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD FOR THE CAMPAIGN.  
Subscriptions to THE STANDARD from now to the close of the campaign will be received at the following rates:  
Single subscription . . . . . \$00  
Ten or more, each . . . . . 70c  
One hundred or more, each . . . . . 65c

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid for the paper forwarded to them for delivery to read it, examine the principles it advocates, and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

## CONTENTS.

The Chicago Conference.

Governor Hill's Vote of the Electoral Reform Bill.

Property in Literary Productions.

Single Tax in Chicago.

Charity Organization.

Outspoken Against Indirect Taxation.

The Chicago Conference.

Pen, Paste and Scissors.

Where Are These Acres?

The "Magic City."

The First Essential Reform.

It is a Free Trade Fight.

The Tariff Reduction Bill.

Colorado "Overcrowded."

Nothing to Do.

The Beating of the Drums.

Men and Things.

Mr. Carnegie's Holiday.

Society Notes.

Louis Prang.

Free Trade the American Idea.

Proprietary and Industrial Inventions.

England and America.

Overhead Reciprocity.

A Song of Protection.

Straws Which Show the Wind.

Christianity—Spirit and Practice.

Current Thought.

Warren Worth Bailey, who by authority of a large number of individual requests called the conference of single tax men to meet in Chicago on July 4, authorizes THE STANDARD to announce the withdrawal of the call. In this Mr. Bailey has acted with good judgment and in consonance with the changed opinion of those who at first were most desirous of the conference. And for the trouble he has taken—for the making of arrangements and the correspondence that has been necessary has entailed much work—he deserves our thanks as much, and even more, than if the conference had taken place. After the presidential election is over we shall be able to come together under much more favorable circumstances.

The Central labor union of New York city passed the following resolutions at its meeting last Sunday without a dissenting voice:

Whereas, A bill securing to the voters of the state of New York electoral reform recently passed the legislature and was placed in the hands of Governor Hill for his signature; and,

Whereas, The workingmen of this state have most emphatically signified their approval of such a bill, believing that it would have secured them the sanctity of the ballot; and,

Whereas, When the said bill came before Governor Hill, he vetoed it in compliance, as we believe, with the dictation of a corrupt political machine which foresaw, in electoral reform, the death of their political power.

Resolved, That we, the Central labor union in session assembled, do hereby condemn the action of Governor Hill in ignoring the expressed will of the people by refusing to sign the electoral reform bill.

These resolutions undoubtedly express the opinion of the great majority of the workingmen of this state, and not of workingmen alone, but of all citizens who realize the corrupt condition of our politics.

There is but one way to give this opinion any effect that politicians will respect, and that is to back it by votes. And the democratic managers ought to be admonished in advance that if Governor Hill is nominated again this year he will lose the vote of every man otherwise inclined to vote the democratic ticket who has this greatest of all political reforms at heart.

The reasons, or to speak more properly, the excuses, which Governor Hill, in the memorandum filed with the bill, gives for his veto, only add certainty to the declaration made by the Central labor union that his real motive was the preservation of the power of the corrupt political machines, which the changes proposed in the bill would have destroyed. Read in the light of the facts—known to no one more certainly than to Governor Hill—that the electors of the state of New York to-day have practically no choice but between the nominees of one or the other of the political machines, and that great numbers of voters are at every election corrupted or intimidated, these excuses only add insult to injury.

The bill popularly known as the Australian or electoral reform bill is officially entitled "An act to secure more fully the independence of electors and the secrecy of the ballot." Its provisions are such as experience has shown to be necessary to this end. With a view of doing away with the necessity which political parties are now under of printing and distributing tickets and employing workers at the polls—things which by the great expense they impose and the organization they require, compel the formation of political machines, and give their bosses power to practically name the candidates who alone

can . . . or election—the bill proposes the printing of official ballots and the presentation to every voter of every candidate. It provides that the names of candidates nominated by conventions representing three per cent of the vote cast, or nominated directly by voters amounting to one per cent of the vote cast, at the previous election—or to 1,000 in the state or 100 in a political subdivision—shall be printed at public expense upon ballots which the voter is to receive at the polls.

For the purpose of preventing any stuffing of the ballot boxes, the ballot clerks are to write their initials upon the back of the ballot before handing it to the voter. He is then to retire into a private apartment, make a mark against the names of those he desires to vote for, or write in any names he pleases, and then vote the ballot so folded as to conceal whom he votes for. In order to acquaint the voter with the names of candidates that he will find upon the ballot, the bill provides for the publication of a list of candidates in two papers in each county, and for the hanging up about the polls of cards containing their names. To prevent wanton obstruction of the voting, it limits the time during which the voter may remain in the private apartment to five minutes. To prevent wanton delay and wanton destruction of ballots, it provides that the voter who spoils his ballot, before receiving another in its place and being entitled to occupy the apartment for another five minutes, shall satisfy the ballot clerks that his spoiling of the ballot was not intentional. To meet the case of those who cannot read, it not only provides for the advertisement of candidates in newspapers and by cards, but the illiterate may require one of the ballot clerks to read him the contents of the ballot, so that he may know the relative positions of the names. Or one of the ballot clerks, sworn to secrecy, and acting under penal provisions, may, at his request, make the marks or do the writing for him.

How these provisions would cure the evils which in this state have made our elections little better than the ratification of the edicts of one set or another of political bosses, is obvious to any one who knows anything of elections in New York. Yet Governor Hill actually assumes to find in them restrictions which would impair the constitutional right of the voter to vote for whom he pleases.

The reasons he gives for this assumption are: That the candidates whose names were thus printed on the ballots and advertised would have an advantage over the others! That the advertising of names is to be only in two papers in each county, representing political parties that in the last election cast the largest and next largest number of votes! That the ballot clerks are "not selected for their character or their political impartiality" but from the same two parties! That the ballot clerks may deny another ballot to the voter who has spoiled a ballot, if they are not satisfied that the spoiling was unintentional! And that votes will be lost if the ballot clerks fail to put their initials upon the ballot—notwithstanding the fact that it is the business of the voter, the inspectors and the watchers to see that they do. The mere statement of these "reasons" is a sufficient answer.

To these remarkable reasons why he considers the electoral reform bill repugnant to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the constitution, Governor Hill adds two others fully as remarkable. The first is that the five minutes which the voter is allowed to spend in the apartment is not enough. "The anxiety, the deliberation, the care, the caution, with which electors at present prepare their ballots, meditating them for days, reconsidering and changing them down to the last moment, exhibit by experience that the hurry, confusion and precipitancy to which this bill compels the voter, is fatal to the free and full operation of his own intelligent volition in the direction of his vote."

Governor Hill is evidently thinking of the voters he has seen standing round the polls in Elmira, cautiously meditating as to who will give them the largest price. This is the only class of voters whose meditations would be hurried or disturbed. All others would have ample opportunity to decide whom they would vote for. Official and non-official publicity would be given to the names of candidates for days before the election. And the voter's business in the compartment would simply consist in making marks (probably from an already marked advertisement or card which he would carry with him) against names previously decided on.

The other objection is that, "under the present law, the illiterate or infirm elector repose his trust in some confidential friend for the preparation of his ballot,

but by this bill he must either lose his vote or avow it to a stranger."

How very careful of infirm and illiterate voters is Governor Hill that he thinks it unconstitutional to provide that one of two sworn public officers, as they may select, shall be permitted to do for them what they cannot do for themselves, to cause the name of the candidate to be printed "in large type" is altogether too vague and indefinite. No statute so important as this should be so loosely constructed, but all its terms should be couched in clear and explicit language.

This terrible indefiniteness relates merely to the cards giving instructions to the voter, which by section 27 the county clerks are required to have printed in English and such other languages as they deem necessary, and the inspectors are required to post. The words of the section are: "Said cards shall be printed in large, clear type."

9.—So hastily or imperfectly was the measure prepared that it omits to provide what compensation, if any, the officials known as "ballot clerks" are to receive for their services.

It is frequently the case that legislative acts create an office, and provide for filling it, without making any provision for compensation. In this case there was ample time to provide for compensation, as the bill would not have gone into effect until the election of 1889.

Governor Hill's final objection to the bill is as follows:

Under this bill any person who can procure a thousand names to his petition can become a candidate for a state office and compel all his tickets to be printed in every county in the state at public expense; and any adventurer, no matter how obscure or unworthy, who can manage to obtain one hundred names to his petition, can become a candidate for an office in a senatorial or congressional district, or in a county or municipality, and likewise compel all his tickets to be printed at public expense.

With such inducements held out, the state, district, county and municipality would be likely to be flooded with candidates possessing little share of public confidence or favor, to the annoyance and distrust, as well as at the expense of the people.

The answer is, that it is impossible to guard against such accidents, which, even if nominations were delayed until the eve of election, might happen on the day of election; that some time must be fixed for the closing of nominations, and that the time of fifteen days before election is a reasonable one, preventing, as ought to be prevented, the holding back of nominations in order to avoid scrutiny, and securing to voters opportunity to examine into the character of the candidates.

2.—It omits to provide how the ballot clerks who are to serve at the first election held under the act are to be elected or appointed at the same time and in the same manner as inspectors of election.

This is not true. Section 19 of the act provides that they shall be elected or appointed at the same time and in the same manner as inspectors of election.

3.—It provides that the county clerk shall deliver the legal ballots to the inspectors of election of each election district before the opening of the polls. How long prior to such opening this delivery is to be made is not provided. Nor is it prescribed how, when, or in what manner, the ballot clerks are to receive the ballots from the inspectors.

This is trivial. The bill provides for the printing of the ballots, for their delivery to the inspectors before the opening of the polls, and for the ballot clerks then having charge of them, which is all that is necessary. It is to be remembered that they do not become legal ballots until initialed by the ballot clerks when handed to the voters:

4.—It provides that the expense of the printing and the distribution of the ballots shall in all cases be a county charge. There is no good reason why counties should assume any part of the expenses of municipal elections, and this provision is unjust and was clearly not intended.

This objection so far as it goes is valid. But it not only does not furnish any sufficient reason for rejecting the bill, but is of very little weight. Not only are the larger political divisions now in many cases put to expenses which might be more properly devolved on the smaller, but the economy in election expenses secured by the bill would much more than make up for any disproportionate expense to which some of the counties might thus be subjected.

5. It requires that the selection of ballot clerks shall be made from the two principal political parties, refusing any representation which should provide substantially that each elector, just before depositing his ballot, should enter a separate compartment or booth provided for that purpose, where he can alone assort and arrange his tickets to suit himself, and from this compartment proceed directly to the inspectors unattended by any one, and deposit his ballot.

Yet not only would such a measure fail to effect that breaking up of the power of machines and bosses which would be secured by the official printing of ballots, but the excuses which the governor has given for his veto of the bill presented to him are convincing proof that he would find excuses enough for withholding his signature from any bill, of even the kind he proposes.

The words of the bill are:

No person other than the electors engaged in receiving, preparing or depositing their ballots shall be permitted to be within said rail, except by authority of the inspectors of election," thus destroying the value of the other preceding provision.

The other objection is that, "under the present law, the illiterate or infirm elector repose his trust in some confidential friend for the preparation of his ballot,

time, or for other such cases. Governor Hill is much troubled about the possibility of candidates dying after they are nominated, but has neglected to think of the possibility of an elector dying or failing in a fit when within the rail.

8.—The provision in section 27 requiring the county clerk of each county to cause the name of the candidate to be printed "in large type" is altogether too vague and indefinite. No statute so important as this should be so loosely constructed, but all its terms should be couched in clear and explicit language.

This terrible indefiniteness relates merely to the cards giving instructions to the voter, which by section 27 the county clerks are required to have printed in English and such other languages as they deem necessary, and the inspectors are required to post. The words of the section are: "Said cards shall be printed in large, clear type."

9.—So hastily or imperfectly was the measure prepared that it omits to provide what compensation, if any, the officials known as "ballot clerks" are to receive for their services.

It is frequently the case that legislative acts create an office, and provide for filling it, without making any provision for compensation. In this case there was ample time to provide for compensation, as the bill would not have gone into effect until the election of 1889.

Governor Hill's final objection to the bill is as follows:

Under this bill any person who can procure a thousand names to his petition can become a candidate for a state office and compel all his tickets to be printed in every county in the state at public expense; and any adventurer, no matter how obscure or unworthy, who can manage to obtain one hundred names to his petition, can become a candidate for an office in a senatorial or congressional district, or in a county or municipality, and likewise compel all his tickets to be printed at public expense.

With such inducements held out, the state, district, county and municipality would be likely to be flooded with candidates possessing little share of public confidence or favor, to the annoyance and distrust, as well as at the expense of the people.

Governor Hill began by objecting that the bill would give some candidates the advantage of getting their tickets printed at public expense, and that this would be to "restrict the elector in the methods by which he may choose to present a candidate for the popular suffrage, and to discriminate between candidates because of the manner in which they are presented to the people." He ends by objecting that the bill makes it too easy for candidates to get their tickets printed!

Perhaps for the sake of electoral reform itself, Governor Hill's nomination is really to be desired. For in that case the republicans will make electoral reform an important part of their campaign in New York, and the defeat of Governor Hill, especially if the state goes for Mr. Cleveland, will be such an evidence of the determination of the people that we shall have the ballot bill in operation as quickly as if Governor Hill had signed it.

NORWICH, N. Y.—It is almost a relief to find even a trivial and passing remark of THE STANDARD to differ with. At the most only three such have refreshed me with a sense of my own superiority of judgment. Postal savings banks (interest paying), and woman suffrage are two of these; but it is to the third that I propose a protest. I do not believe that there is any natural property in the creations of one's brains, or that a government countenances robbery that fails to enact a copyright law for the protection of foreign authors. If I publish my thought or my knowledge by shouting it on the streets or by printing and hawking it, it is no longer mine, except for the credit of it. If a government conceives it politic to encourage its wise men by granting them statutory monopolies in their writings and inventions, it is well; but justice makes no such demand; and it is difficult to see the policy of protecting the production of that which has its own sufficient incentive in the laws of other countries. The author's cry of "robber" seems to me as impertinent as the manufacturer's demand for protection.

The difficulty of my correspondent arises from confusions of thought, which are so common that it is worth while endeavoring to clear them up. Even the advocates of international copyright seldom put their claims upon the true ground, and, with the exception—to her honor!—of the republic of Mexico, which gives perpetual copyright, the copyright laws of all civilized countries, like our own domestic copyright law, seem to treat the right of the author to control the publication of his book as though it rested upon the same ground and was of the same nature as the patents granted for invention. The constitution of the United States itself does this in declaring that "the congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

Governor Hill pays to the public opinion that supports the bill he has vetoed the tribute of saying that he would "cheerfully approve a well considered measure which should provide substantially that each elector, just before depositing his ballot, should enter a separate compartment or booth provided for that purpose, where he can alone assort and arrange his tickets to suit himself, and from this compartment proceed directly to the inspectors unattended by any one, and deposit his ballot."

Nevertheless, though superficially alike, there is an essential difference between the patent for an invention and the copyright for a book. The one, which gives a right of property in the use of a device or process—that is to say, in an idea—rests on no natural right, but can only be upheld as a matter of policy. The other gives no property in ideas. It merely recognizes the right of property in a particular form, itself a product of labor, in which ideas are made tangible; a right which, irrespective of questions of policy, is a natural right—resting on the same ground as the right of the fisherman to the fish he catches, of the farmer to the crop he raises, of the builder to the house he constructs.

There has reached me by the last English mail a little book which I am glad to see. It is a text book on Political Economy by Professor J. E. Symes of University college, Nottingham, published by Rivingtons of London. I am exceedingly glad to see it, for it is to me one of the indications that certain great truths which I have striven to popularize are nearing the last of the three stages into which some one, whose name I now forget, divided the progress of a great truth:

1. It is ridiculous and not to be considered.

2. It is against religion and destructive of the rights of property and society.

3. We always knew it.

In this book Professor Symes never

once mentions my name nor so much as

alludes to me or to any of my writings,

for he judges rightly, I think, that it will

be read and accepted by many who would

be repelled by prejudice from anything

bearing my name. Yet the essential

doctrines of this book, which are put so

nature, and in which we find ourselves. Ownership comes from production. It cannot come from discovery. Discovery can give no right of ownership. Islands, continents, stars, natural laws and relations, new ways of doing things, or the possibility of doing new things, may be discovered, and this discovery may be the result of labor. But no man can discover anything which, so to speak, was not put there to be discovered, and which some one else might not in time have discovered. If he finds it, it was not lost. It, or its potentiality, existed before he came. It was there to be found.

It is evidently the perception of this truth, that discovery can give no just claim to ownership, that leads my correspondent to think there can be no basis in justice for ownership in literary productions, and gives rise to the common assertion in this connection that there can be no property in productions of the brain. He is right enough as to the principle, but he is confused in its application. He confounds the copyright with the patent, just as the framers of our constitution seem to have confounded it, and as it is generally confounded, and proceeds on the supposition that it involves the right of property in ideas.

In this he is clearly mistaken. The exclusive privilege given by a patent—the exclusive privilege of making a certain kind of machine or using a certain device, or applying a certain combination for a certain purpose, does confer property in an idea, a perception, or the use of a natural law. It prevents all but the grantee from making that kind of a machine or using that kind of a device, or applying that kind of a combination. But the recognition of the exclusive right of the author to reprint his book gives no such exclusive privilege. It prevents no one from writing that kind of a book. It prevents no one from using either his own ideas or even the ideas he may find in the copyrighted book. It recognizes a right of property, not in any facts stated, not in any thoughts expressed, not in any discovery pointed out, not in any moral drawn; but merely in the book itself—in that particular arrangement of words which gives it identity as a particular piece of work clearly distinguishable from works by other authors, or even from another work on the same subject written by the same author—should he try to do the same thing twice.

"If I publish my thought or my knowledge by showing it on the streets or by printing or hawking it, it is no longer mine, except for the credit of it," says my correspondent. This is quite true in the sense that I am no longer the exclusive possessor of it—as I might possibly have imagined myself to be before. But in the sense that publication takes away any right of ownership, it is not the full truth. To a thought or perception there is no right of ownership either before or after publication. Every one has a moral right to think what I think or perceive what I perceive. He may do it independently of me or he may do it on the hint from me. But in neither case have I any moral right to forbid him. Nor does a copyright give me any power to forbid him.

No matter how hard may have been the mental process by which I arrive at certain conclusions, or how laboriously I may have discovered certain facts, as soon as I publish them—and it is only when I do publish them that the copyright laws apply—any one may appropriate them and use them as his own. All that the copyright law gives me is the right of property in the particular book—in the particular and identical form in which the ideas set forth in my book are expressed.

This form is the result of my labor in the same sense and to the same extent that a coat or a house is the result of labor. And for the same reason there attaches to it of natural right the same exclusive right of ownership.

In the production of any material thing—a machine, for instance—there are two separable parts—the abstract idea or principle, which may be usually expressed by drawing, by writing or by word of mouth; and the concrete form of the particular machine itself, which is produced by bringing together in certain relations, certain quantities and qualities of matter, such as wood, steel, brass, brick, rubber, cloth, etc. There are two modes in which labor goes to the making of the machine—the one in ascertaining the principle on which such machines can be made to work; the other in obtaining from their natural reservoirs and bringing together and fashioning into shape the quantities and qualities of matter which in their combination constitute the concrete machine. In the first mode, labor is expended in discovery. In the second mode, it is expended in production. The work of discovery may be done once for all, as in the case of the discovery in prehistoric time of the principle or idea of the wheelbarrow. But the work of production is required afresh in the case of each particular thing. No matter how many thousand millions of wheelbarrows have been

produced, it requires fresh labor of production to make another one.

Now the expenditure of labor in the invention or discovery of the idea of a machine gives no natural right of ownership in the idea. Not only is the potentiality of such a machine a part of the common heritage to which there can be in justice no exclusive claim, but each invention or discovery is usually—perhaps, except in cases of sheer accident, it may be said invariably—the last step in a series which began with the discovery of fire or the invention of the stone ax. And not only can we confidently say in the case of any device that supplies a need, and is therefore valuable, that if one person had not discovered it, others would have done so; but as a matter of fact it usually appears in such cases that a number of persons have been contemporaneously working toward the same end.

The natural reward of labor expended in discovery is in the use that can be made of the discovery without interference with the right of any one else to use it. But to this natural reward our patent laws endeavor to add an artificial reward. Although the effect of giving to the discoverers of useful devices or processes an absolute right to their exclusive use would be to burden all industry with most grievous monopolies, and to greatly retard, if not put a stop to, further inventions; yet the theory of our patent laws is that we can stimulate discoveries by giving a modified right of ownership in their use for a term of years. In this we seek by special laws to give a special reward to labor expended in discovery, which does not belong to it of natural right, and is of the nature of a bounty.

But as for labor expended in the second of these modes—in the production of the machine by the bringing together in certain relations of certain quantities and qualities of matter, we need no special laws to reward that. Absolute ownership attaches to the results of such labor, not by special law, but by common law. And if all human laws were abolished, men would still hold that whether it were a wheelbarrow or a phonograph, the concrete thing belonged to the man who produced it. And this, not for a term of years, but in perpetuity. It would pass at his death to his heirs or those to whom he devised it.

Now a book—I do not mean the printed and bound volume which is the result of the labor of printers, bookbinders, and subsidiary industries; but the succession of words which is the result of the labor of the author—if not a material thing, is quite as tangible a thing as a machine. And in the labor that goes to its production there are the same two separable parts. There is what I have called the "labor of discovery," which goes to the idea of the book, and as to which, as in the case of the inventor of the machine, the author must draw on those who have gone before, for a perfectly original literary man would have to begin by inventing letters. There is also the labor of production—labor of essentially the same kind, though it deals not with matter, but with immaterial things, as that which in the case of a machine is expended in bringing wood, steel, brass, etc., into certain proportions and relations. It is this labor of production, which results in a tangible identity, that gives ownership to the author as a matter of natural right. And it is this right of ownership, not in ideas, but in the tangible result of labor expended in production, that copyright secures.

I presume that one of the principal reasons why the real nature and grounds of property in literary productions is so little appreciated, is that what I have called the "labor of production" is little understood except by writers. The common idea is that the man who writes a book has only to decide as to what he wants to say and then sit down and write it out. Nothing could be more fallacious. Over and above any "labor of discovery" expended in thinking out what to say, is the "labor of production" expended on how to say it. Even the most carelessly written works require some of this. But carefully written works, and especially the works on thoughtful subjects that read as though they had flowed from the author's pen as easily and as naturally as water flows down hill, require in the mere labor of production, in the mere choice of words, arrangement of sentences and sequence of presentation, an amount and intensity of exertion that one who has not attempted it can hardly appreciate. If any one thinks that to write a book all that is necessary is to get the ideas and then write it out, let him sit down and try. If he has critical ability to judge of what he is doing, he will soon find himself involved in labor to which digging wells or breaking stones will seem easy; and will ere long appreciate the good sense of the man who apologized for the length of a letter on the ground that he did not have time to write a short one. Now, this labor of literary production is essentially the same kind of labor as that

which produces houses, crops, clothing, ships, or any of the material things which man makes. It requires the exertion of the same will power; it involves the exhaustion of the same nervous energy. Mental work is no metaphorical phrase. Any one who has held himself to it knows that it is labor as truly as is physical work.

If my correspondent will think over the matter I am sure that he will see that it is on this firm basis that the right of property in literary productions rests, and that its recognition, instead of being like that system of spoliation called protection, an impairment and denial of natural right, is but the securing to the author of the natural reward of his labor. He will see that in permitting the works of foreign authors to be republished here without their permission we are really countenancing robbery, as truly as if we permitted our own people to despoil foreigners of their watches or their clothes. And if he has any doubt that in this, as in other things, "honesty is the best policy," he will see, if he chooses to trace it, the cramping and degrading effects of this legalization of robbery upon our national literature and national thought.

And this also is worth considering. The right to use an author's work without his consent, involves the right to use any part of it—to mutilate and garble. Many instances of this have occurred to foreign writers on this side of the water, and to American writers on that. Not long since a friend of mine, a newspaper man, met another newspaper man.

"What are you doing?" said my friend, "and why do you look so mournful?"

"I am editing Dickens, and I don't like the work."

"Editing Dickens! what do you mean?"

"I am editing Dickens for the library. It's my business to cut him down, so that every volume will come into 350 pages."

#### THE SINGLE TAX IN CHICAGO.

A Concise Report of a Capable Speech by J. Z. White.

An interesting discussion of the single tax doctrine took place at a meeting in Chicago on the 14th inst. The address of the evening was delivered by Mr. J. Z. White. He said:

Land is the basis of all wealth. Without land there could be no wealth. Land is useless without labor. Labor is helpless without access to land. There is nothing that we use but what is obtained from the earth, either directly or indirectly.

Capital is therefore the result of stored labor, and labor the utilization of land.

Access to land is the common right of all. The result of labor belongs to the laborer.

The common right of all cannot be exclusively an individual right; therefore the individual avails himself of a privilege in the exclusive occupancy of land, for which privilege he should pay in the form of a tax upon the land at its true value.

Personal property (which includes buildings) being the result of labor, and labor being a natural right, it is wrong to tax it. To abolish that tax and to concentrate all taxes upon land is the object of the single tax movement.

Exchanges are more advantageously made in densely populated than in sparsely settled localities.

Equal justice to all would be established by free exchange, but, because of advantage of location, freedom of exchange is practically limited, inasmuch as competition is often curtailed by location. For this advantage to some individuals the community receives no equivalent. We propose an equivalent in the form of a tax on the land at its true value. It is a crude notion that when a man buys land he acquires the title to it.

No title can be better than that which precedes it.

That which a man makes belongs to him.

The man who made the land has not materialized.

No man can convey a title to land because there is no title to convey.

The aristocracy of Europe originated in grants of land.

There is danger of a land aristocracy in this country.

Large tracts of land are obtained in a wild state, and so held; the influx of population places an increasing value upon it, and it is bequeathed as an inheritance for continual aggrandizement. Facts prove this. About one-half of Manhattan island is as wild today as it was a century ago! Within a few miles are the crowded tenement houses, where the pitifully poor are suffocated every year for want of a little more room and a little more air!

The picture has its counterpart in Chicago. Three-fourths of the land in Chicago is vacant, held on speculation. It is as if so much of the city were cut off and that we were crowded on to a smaller earth.

Why is the waste land not utilized? At least it could produce something. Its owners would see that it did produce something if it were taxed at its true value.

We propose to tax land at its true value. We propose to abolish taxes on personal property.

No man has the right to tax the product of his fellow laborer's toil.

No man can delegate to the government a right that he does not possess as an individual.

The tax that England attempted to impose on its subjects, which led to the American revolution, was an insignificant tax in comparison with that imposed on personal property to-day.

A liberal preacher recently deprecated these discussions on the ground that we were fanning the flame of discontent. He may rely upon us to fan that flame so long as discontent guards us from slavery.

Liberty is older than slavery.

The rights of man are founded upon eternal law.

It is in this spirit and for this purpose that we raise the cross of this new crusade.

Of course.

ST. JOSEPH, Mo.—The other day a friend was expatiating to me upon some patent French blacking he has got hold of. He told me that as a twenty-five cent bottle suffices for twenty applications, that is, a cost of one and a quarter cents per application, he now saves eight and three-quarter cents per day, as before it always cost him daily ten cents to have the boots blacked. According to the protectionist idea is not this man an enemy of his country and ought not the bootblack industry demand a protective duty?

A. K. MAYNARD.

#### CHARITY ORGANIZATION.

Josephine Shaw Lowell Defends Its Motives and Methods, and Rebukes Dr. De Costa.

To the Editor of the Standard—Sir: I was surprised to find in your column a letter and paper by the Rev. Dr. De Costa, condemning the principles and methods of the charity organization societies of New York and other cities, the statements of which, it is evident from your editorial comments, you have made no attempt to verify.

Dr. De Costa entirely misapprehends both the principles and methods of the various charity organization societies; and while I concede that the dangers and temptations of those societies lie in the direction he points out, I deny that what he says of their practice is true either in whole or in part.

I do not claim that the Charity organization society which attains its ideal, but I desire to say to your readers that that ideal is the lifting to an independent, self respecting position of every individual who comes to help, and that it is at one with Dr. De Costa in his condemnation of "dolees" as a means of helping any one permanently.

The main object of these societies, both here and in England, is to search out the causes of the poverty of individuals and to remove these, and thus to cure, instead of merely alleviating distress. I have found no better description of the ideal of the believer in the organization of charity, so far as regards his individual duty to a fellow being in need, than was given by Dr. De Costa himself in a sermon preached last winter against the New York society, in which he thought he was describing the exact opposite of the course pursued by members of that society.

The particular part of the work of the society which is especially objected to by him, is in its attempts to prevent dishonest persons from making a living by appeals to the sympathy of the benevolent, it undertakes mainly for the purpose of protecting others from the temptation to which the success of such methods on the part of their friends and neighbors exposes them; the protection of the pockets of those who give—except in so far as such protection makes the successor of those who really need help more possible, is considered of far less importance. In other words, the discovery of impostors is a moral and not an economic work.

The charity organization societies agree with Dr. De Costa that pauperism mainly comes from "ignorance and the law of heredity," and therefore they seek to teach those in need and also to save their children from following in their footsteps. The societies differ from Dr. De Costa in believing that one of the potent causes of pauperism is "indiscriminate liberality," and for the sake of the paupers and of those who are tempted by indiscriminate liberality to become paupers, they seek to repress such liberality and to substitute for it intelligent liberality.

Your own evident ignorance of the aims of those who are trying to organize charity I regret very much. When you say that many of the charges made by Dr. De Costa are undoubtedly true, you show but little acquaintance with the work of the people you so harshly condemn, and when you give even an indirect and qualified sanction to his statement that "the managers regard the poor man as a dangerous animal," you do a grievous injustice to the hundreds you may think of men and women who in this country and in England are spending their lives in trying to discover the best way not only to "comfort and help the weak hearted," but to radically improve the conditions under which the great mass of their fellow men live and to substitute for it intelligent liberality.

As I have said, the ostensible object of the charity organization societies is to see out the causes of poverty in individuals, and to cure these; but this naturally leads to the study of the causes of poverty in general; and many of the members of those societies think earnestly and honestly upon social questions, and do and will help toward the solution of the social and moral problems which will still confront us for many years, even should the struggle for existence be rendered less bitter by the adoption of free trade and to some extent by the removal of the tariff.

As I have said, the ostensible object of the charity organization societies is to see out the causes of poverty in individuals, and to cure these; but this naturally leads to the study of the causes of poverty in general; and many of the members of those societies think earnestly and honestly upon social questions, and do and will help toward the solution of the social and moral problems which will still confront us for many years, even should the struggle for existence be rendered less bitter by the adoption of free trade and to some extent by the removal of the tariff.

I consider myself entitled to speak with authority concerning the principles and methods of the New York charity organization society, at least, as I was one of its originators and am still a member of its central council.

JOSEPHINE SHAW LOWELL,  
120 East 30th street, June 14, 1888.

#### OUTSPOKEN AGAINST INDIRECT TAXATION.

Philadelphia Workingmen Issue an Address and Do Some Telling Against the Tariff.

By order of the Workingmen's tariff reform association No. 1 of Philadelphia, of which Thomas Grant is president, John Harle vice-president and F. A. Herwig secretary, an address has been issued to the workingmen of the United States, declaring for free trade, and calling upon their fellow toilers to vote with that party which advocates free raw materials and tariff reform.

The address asserts that toilers are no better off to-day than they were twenty years ago. All sorts of efforts, it says, have from time to time been made by workmen to alleviate social ills, but their efforts have been directed against effects, not causes, and have resulted in destroying some wrongs only to make way for others. The root of the evil has not been attacked, and one after another labor organizations have succumbed without having accomplished a real and lasting remedy.

The first evil to be attacked, says the address, is the system of indirect taxation, which, under the specious plea of contributing to the support of government, taxes the masses for the benefit of a few individuals.

And the chief feature in the very present is the protective tariff.

When monopoly professes anxiety for the protection of labor it is not applying the squares of the pickpocket, who charms your senses with flattering words while his nimble hands are deep in your pocket.

It is not self evident that if labor were left in the free enjoyment of its natural rights and the rewards for its toil, it would not be in such a condition as to protect itself. Can it be said that those who are constantly reducing wages, impoverishing labor and dictating laws which make it more and more impossible for it to have equality of rights in the fixing of terms for its time and toil, can be trusted to protect it? Heaven preserve it from such protectors!

The absurdity of the pretension, even in the light of protectionist argument, that the present rate of tariff is required to sustain wages is shown in these words:

"The wages of labor are but little more than seventeen per cent of the product. In other words, the amount that fails to labor out of the total value of the products is only \$17 out of every \$100. Now, does it not stand to reason that if a tariff be at all necessary an average tariff duty of seventeen per cent would be ample sufficient to protect American labor against foreign labor, even if the latter got no wages at all? Yet the average of

tariff duties now is forty-seven per cent, although the difference in the wages between this and other countries is not five per cent, calculated upon the relative productiveness of labor. Why, then, is this extra thirty per cent put on?

The answer given is that it frees big manufacturers from competition, while it does not interfere with their liberty to draw their labor from the markets of the world. The result is that labor is cheap and products are dear.

The methods which the Workingmen's tariff reform club means to pursue to attain its ends are thus described:

As workingmen we hold the interests of labor paramount to every other consideration, and hence we propose to push the battle for freedom from burdensome taxation—the key to the labor question—to an early term. We will not stop to haggle over the question of who is the cook. We will no longer serve that party which will not serve us. We will cast out bastards, leaving aside every bias and prejudice to unite with any and all men who are fighting the same battle. It is in this way that we can make party serve us, and thus make the struggle for our rights a short and decisive one.

We care not by whatever other name you call it, we will support that party that is for free raw materials and tariff reform.

RS.

id will be  
ity will be  
r that the  
land at the  
proposes to  
of great  
or working  
ad tea cost  
not over a  
well man-  
charitable

people com-  
munity,  
The num-  
ber 101,200 as  
Most of

traveling  
and multi-  
tional travel-  
israelites,  
der Moses,  
two hun-  
employed

ng rapidly.  
ch colonial  
iders and  
it in large  
ies are ex-  
disease, in  
racting in  
of infection

in Norway  
feet from  
e ounces of  
ystals are  
grad-  
l its whole  
hue. The  
new and  
2

companies  
ved to have  
id of white  
age is that  
white paper  
the eyesight  
green has  
d combina-  
so printed

district re-  
employed in  
ur digging,  
iles, thirty-  
being em-  
iries are com-  
upon iron ore,  
that they  
the same

t alike. As  
the want of  
part of the  
overweighs  
little to the  
of the right  
that of the  
the mid-  
right ear is  
ear.

re ducks in  
e of it. They  
ivate roads  
and smaller  
on each of  
Their eggs  
ant articles  
abundant  
in California  
severly var-  
d in all the  
exported to

be so inde-  
that vessels  
ed years, to  
f their poor  
models. The  
remarkable  
reat weight,  
ight varying  
the per cubic  
ount of the  
d in it, the  
an away. Is  
spikes and  
omes in con-

opening ad-  
nal conven-  
now 150,000  
and that  
ed with the  
. In the  
years when  
90 boxes of  
es, 1,500,000  
gallons of  
ing, in his  
the value of  
of raisins at  
per gallon, i  
planted in  
to \$8 per  
as a place  
al capital of  
in Califor-  
90,000 acres  
in vines

us absorbent  
cerine. Sec-  
d as absorb-  
most satisfa-  
sorial earth,  
if extremely  
it is of this

It absorbs  
be glycerine,  
aces. Thus  
seventy-five  
d its blinding  
ro-glycerine,  
same ratio  
ever so high  
rees Fahrne-  
as glycerine  
be carefully  
an expansive  
al weight of

risks and  
ment.

have main-  
the world  
our indus-  
Under panics  
and recessions  
prostrating  
industry. Who  
d to feed the  
swarmed for  
years, when  
Mr. in the east-  
added of his  
x. It is a  
any inter-  
monopoly iff  
will re-  
uper basis  
carriers of  
riff against  
immigrants  
in them!

I blow.

hat on the  
ises of this  
population  
of our in-  
nemence of  
ur national  
course, are  
late invest-  
holders do  
rest in any

## WHERE ARE THOSE ACRES?

NEW YORK.—THE STANDARD of June 9 has this excerpt from the Portland, Ore., Oregonian:

You of the east who are bawling "land monopoly," just look this way. Here are millions of acres you can have for a song, for a couple of cents a acre, come right along. No taxes in squatting down in the eastern cities and selling "land monopoly." Come out here and become "monopolists" yourselves. (Henry George's paper please copy.)

The Oregonian is a reputable journal. It is the oldest paper in Portland. It has a reputation for truth and veracity. When I lived in Portland it was the leading daily, and earned a considerable reputation for the gallant fight it waged against the aggressions of monopoly—especially railroad monopoly. It was prudently managed by Henry L. Pitcock, and ably edited by W. Lair Hill, assisted by the Moreland brothers and others. It is to be hoped that these gentlemen still conduct its affairs, for if they do, they will be able to prove in detail the general assertion they have made. I first visited Oregon nineteen years ago, and again visited it ten years ago. On each visit I searched long and earnestly for some of the acres which the Oregonian now asserts can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them." I could not find them, and I want to know where they are to be found now.

Where are those acres? Are they any where near Portland? Are they any in the country back of Portland? Are they any where near East Portland? That land was all taken up long enough before I ever saw Oregon. Are they to be found east of the Willamette river? That land was set aside until the railroad should be built, when the company would receive each alternate section of land twenty miles each side of the track, and the balance was to be sold to incoming settlers at two dollars and a half an acre. Meantime all who settled on those government sections would do so at their own risk. But the land speculators were on hand, and somehow they got that land—that is, they got all that the railroad company didn't get.

Are they to be found west of the Willamette river? Nearly all that land was taken out of the market, for the same reason as was that on the east side, and what was left got into the same hands.

Are they to be found in the Willamette valley at all? No! Then where are they to be found? Perhaps the Oregonian knows.

Are they to be found along the upper Columbia river, between the mouth of the Willamette and the Dalles, or the mouth of the Snake? I ask the Oregonian if all that land is not virtually in the hands of the great monopoly which controls all the means of transportation in that section of country.

Are they to be found in the Walla Walla country? Remember, now, the Oregonian says these acres are to be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them."

Let us retrace our steps, for if we are not careful we will be crossing the line into British territory.

Are they to be found between the mouth of the Willamette and the mouth of the Columbia? The Northern Pacific railroad has a line of road running along the Washington territory bank of the Columbia for nearly the whole distance, and the alternate sections for forty miles each side of the track now belong to that corporation—forty miles back into Washington territory and forty miles back into the state of Oregon, while most of the odd sections have been grabbed by God only knows who—and the balance is hard indeed to find.

Are they to be found in what is known as the Lewis river country? I explored that section and found it good; but when I went to the land office at Vancouver I found the plate had been taken away to Washington. "Reserved for the Northern Pacific," the clerk told me.

Are they to be found in the Grand Ronde valley? That was an Indian reservation in my time; but I understand that lately the Indians have been removed and the valley opened for settlement. If that is true, it would be safe to wager that the same old gang of land grabbers got it and doled, or doled, it out to victims of misplaced confidence at so much an acre.

Are they to be found along Puget sound—that magnificent inland sea whose banks should be lined with teeming cities? That land was grabbed long ago by the lumber lords, and no man can set his foot on either bank without paying tribute.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land. Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Oregon and Washington territory is a golden spot. In the beautiful Willamette valley, and in the Columbia river region, and under the shadows of old Mount Hood, Rainier and St. Helens, and along the magnificent Puget sound, is room for millions; but at all the entrances to this paradise stand the land grabber and monopolist. No free tickets there, despite the assertion of the Oregonian. Let any person whose eyes are turned to that country put money in his purse, for he will need it if he wants to get a foothold there; and despite what the Oregonian has said, there is no more use for a moneyless man in Oregon or Washington territory than there is right here in New York. WM. McCABE.

A Democratic Candidate of the Right Sort.

The democrats of the Second district of Maine have nominated for congress Charles E. Allen of Cedar Grove. Mr. Allen was originally a printer, but is now a farmer and is a thorough free trader. In a letter on another matter to the editor of THE STANDARD he says of himself and his prospects:

I am a free trader, having first got the idea from William Lloyd Garrison, with whom I was acquainted. In Maine, the home of Blaine, free traders have up hill work. I have written much on the subject, and it has attracted attention and abuse. Of course it is a labor of love, and at times an expensive luxury. But I have made an impression.

Usually I have acted with the republicans, although no republican paper would publish my free trade articles, while the democratic ones did. When Cleveland's last message appeared I avowed myself very strongly a Cleveland man, although as a Knight of Labor I had hoped for a new party. The largest democratic convention ever assembled in Maine nominated me—an avowed free trader—as candidate for congress from the Second district, now represented by Nelson Dingley, Jr. I at first regarded it as a forlorn hope, but now think I have a good fighting chance and shall work for it. Many

of the farmers hereabouts have been frightened by such demagogic sheets as the New York Tribune into the idea that your land tax theory will take away their farms. As opportunity may offer I shall endeavor to correct this impression by the use, for instance, of such illustrations as the fact that a wild tract of land is held at Bar Harbor for speculative purposes, taxed at a nominal rate, and valued at \$60,000, while farms not far distant, worth not a tenth part of that amount, are taxed for all they will bear, with the buildings and stock taxed additionally.

I am circulating "Progress and Poverty," "Social Problems," and THE STANDARD, and hope to make people see just what you say, even if they do not fully agree with you.

## He Just Began to See the Light.

SAMARIA, Mich.—I find the following by Dr. David Livingstone, the African explorer and missionary, in an article entitled "The South African Boers and Slavery," written somewhere between 1840 and 1845:

"The primitive charter contained the conditions that we should subdue and replenish the soil. The earth is the original inheritance of the entire species; for it is written, 'The earth hath given to the children of men.' Such being the charter on which all primitive lands may be held, it seems plain that a man who subdues or cultivates a portion of the earth has a better right to it than he who only hunts over it. He bestows his labor upon it, and that is his property, viewed in the light of the divine and primitive charter."

No man has a right to perpetuate a wilderness in any part of the world if his brother man needs it for subsistence. The most humid predicator will admit our orthodoxy up to this point. But the doctrine has rather a wide application. It would strip Earl Grey of his broad acres around Alnwick castle as well as Sandilands of the gorges and blood stained valleys of the Amatola. It would place in the very same category English and Irish landlords who evict their tenants in order to form deer parks, and the bushmen who endeavor to perpetuate a wilderness with their poisoned arrows."

If Dr. Livingstone had spent as much time among the dispossessed of his own country as he did among the dispossessed of Africa he might now be held as an authority in the great cause for equal rights. A. F. OSBORN.

## A Word to the "Tribune."

NEW YORK.—The Tribune has hit upon another of the many "facts" which have no sort of bearing on the tariff question, but which it declares ought to be an effective warning to this country against free trade. It says the average wages of the Dutch laborer are \$3 for six days' work of twelve hours each, and for "skilled labor of a very high class" not more than \$4.50 to \$5—scarcely more than carpenters and bricklayers receive for one day's work. "Holdland," says the Tribune, "enjoys the blessings of free trade," and then it exclaims: "Do American workingmen have the blessings of this sort?"

Let us retrace our steps, for if we are not careful we will be crossing the line into British territory.

Are they to be found between the mouth of the Willamette and the mouth of the Columbia? The Northern Pacific railroad has a line of road running along the Washington territory bank of the Columbia for nearly the whole distance, and the alternate sections for forty miles each side of the track now belong to that corporation—forty miles back into Washington territory and forty miles back into the state of Oregon, while most of the odd sections have been grabbed by God only knows who—and the balance is hard indeed to find.

Are they to be found in the Walla Walla country? Remember, now, the Oregonian says these acres are to be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them."

Let us retrac our steps, for if we are not careful we will be crossing the line into British territory.

Are they to be found between the mouth of the Willamette and the mouth of the Columbia? The Northern Pacific railroad has a line of road running along the Washington territory bank of the Columbia for nearly the whole distance, and the alternate sections for forty miles each side of the track now belong to that corporation—forty miles back into Washington territory and forty miles back into the state of Oregon, while most of the odd sections have been grabbed by God only knows who—and the balance is hard indeed to find.

Are they to be found in the Lewis river country? I explored that section and found it good; but when I went to the land office at Vancouver I found the plate had been taken away to Washington. "Reserved for the Northern Pacific," the clerk told me.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found along Puget sound—that magnificent inland sea whose banks should be lined with teeming cities? That land was grabbed long ago by the lumber lords, and no man can set his foot on either bank without paying tribute.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found in the Lewis river country? I explored that section and found it good; but when I went to the land office at Vancouver I found the plate had been taken away to Washington. "Reserved for the Northern Pacific," the clerk told me.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found along Puget sound—that magnificent inland sea whose banks should be lined with teeming cities? That land was grabbed long ago by the lumber lords, and no man can set his foot on either bank without paying tribute.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found in the Lewis river country? I explored that section and found it good; but when I went to the land office at Vancouver I found the plate had been taken away to Washington. "Reserved for the Northern Pacific," the clerk told me.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found along Puget sound—that magnificent inland sea whose banks should be lined with teeming cities? That land was grabbed long ago by the lumber lords, and no man can set his foot on either bank without paying tribute.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found in the Lewis river country? I explored that section and found it good; but when I went to the land office at Vancouver I found the plate had been taken away to Washington. "Reserved for the Northern Pacific," the clerk told me.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

I have it. There is the Columbia river bar—a long, narrow expanse of sand, twenty miles or more long, and some five miles wide, over which the white capped waves of old ocean break year in and year out. I know the place well. I have crossed it a number of times, and spent the best part of a day and night on a portion of it, called Sand island. It is studded with wrecks, including the bones of the steamship on which I made my involuntary stay. That must be the place. The land speculator and the corporate monopolies have passed that bar by in their search for new territory to grab.

Are they to be found along Puget sound—that magnificent inland sea whose banks should be lined with teeming cities? That land was grabbed long ago by the lumber lords, and no man can set his foot on either bank without paying tribute.

Are they to be found east of the Cascade mountains? The cattle lords own that land.

Where are these acres that can be had "just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

## THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at

2 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$1.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the post office, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attended to. Remittances will not be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom general terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

**THE STANDARD** is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

## IT IS A FREE TRADE FIGHT.

When Governor Hill spoke for Tammany Hall in ratification of the platform and nominations made at St. Louis, he said: "If it had been a free trade platform I would not be here!" In a few days the county democracy will hold their ratification meeting, and it remains to be seen whether the spokesmen of that branch of the local democracy will likewise endeavor to discredit the work of the party at large. But despite the effort of Tammany Hall to face both ways, and the possibility that the county democracy may attempt the same hazardous feat, every day makes it more clear that the real leaders of the democratic party are irreversibly enlisted in the struggle against protection. Neither President Cleveland, nor the party platform, nor the party itself, is committed to the doctrine of free trade, and Daniel Doherty might truly say even now that whoever asserts the contrary insults the intelligence of the party; but president, party, and platform are committed to opposition to the doctrine of protection, and whoever asserts the contrary insults the intelligence of all intelligent men.

Without referring to the president's message, or to its endorsement by the democratic platform, or to the Mills bill, which was prepared to give effect to the recommendations of the message, or to the galaxy of democratic statesmen, who on economic rather than fiscal grounds have defended that bill in congress, or to the tide of opinion in the democratic party so obviously rising against the notion of protection by tariffs, it is safe to say that men like Congressmen Mills, McMillen, Breckinridge and Wilson are better exponents of the dominating thought of the party than is Governor Hill or the district managers and wire pulling statesmen of Tammany Hall. And from the lips of these men comes no uncertain sound. All of them spoke at the Reform club dinner last Saturday, and none of them said either directly or by innuendo that if the platform were a free trade platform they would not have been there. The question of surplus and all tariff tinkering notions they subordinated or entirely ignored in favor of the one sentiment, that all unnecessary burdens between producer and consumer should be removed.

Said Mr. Mills: "If there is a higher plane where capital can be more securely invested, where it will yield better returns, where labor will be more largely employed and receive higher wages, then it is your duty to advance and occupy that higher altitude." Referring to the contention of protectionists, "that only good results can be obtained from restricting commerce—building a sort of Chinese wall around the country," he asked why we should not stimulate commerce by carrying out this principle "to the greatest point of protection and build it around every man," so there could be no competition from foreign labor and "every man would be a Robinson Crusoe, monarch of all he surveys." He left no room to infer that the party policy stops short of abolishing protective tariffs by declaring that "the policy of Mr. Cleveland and his administration is to relieve all unnecessary burdens which exist between the producer and the consumer," and after lauding at the republican notion that America can send her products to Europe and expect cash in return he concluded in these words:

Here is the issue before you. We have got to teach our people the true position on this matter and show them that protection, instead of helping labor, destroys it. We must enlighten the minds of our laboring people on this question and show them that they should receive the full value of their wages, instead of having it diverted to the extent of forty-seven per cent to swell the enormous surplus in the treasury. When we get them to understand this question as our fathers understood it when they broke down the barriers between our states, then there will be no difficulty in handing this matter and reducing taxation to a basis sufficient for the support of the government.

Mr. McMillen of Tennessee spoke to the same effect, and C. R. Beckinridge of Arkansas cut off all suspicion that he might not have been present if the platform had been a free trade platform; when he said:

Only in the last five or six years have we seen the revival of a mediæval school of thinkers, backed now for the first time in modern times by a political party, who hold that war and the attendants and consequences of war do not retard the growth and prosperity of a country, that taxation is a good thing of itself, that exchange between nations is hurtful and bad, and that the higher the

taxes and the more restrictive the embargoes upon trade the better it is for the people.

Mr. Wilson of West Virginia was no less emphatic than his associates. He described the efforts of the protectionists to make laborers believe that protection protects as the safest of all the false pretenses that any system ever made for the purpose of blinding its followers, and pertinently asked whether the "protected" iron worker turns to the tariff to find out what wages he shall be paid, or is forced upon the labor market to get what that fixes the value of his work at, tariff or no tariff.

There can no longer be a doubt; and these speeches at the Reform club dinner are only one of many reasons for the belief that the democracy under its present leadership is bent upon destroying the system of protection that has so long fettered our commerce, fattened our monopolies, and promoted the impoverishment of our labor. It is so plain that all free traders, whatever may have been their party affiliations and however intense their hatred of the democratic machine and their contempt for its colorless policy in the past, are confronted with the imperative duty of lending to the national democratic party their hearty support in the approaching campaign. Republican success will be a temporary but disheartening defeat of the free trade principle, while democratic success will be a free trade victory, as full of promise to the white slave of today as was the election of Lincoln to the black slave of a generation ago. On the result of this election may depend the leadership of one of the two established parties—whether it shall be guided by doctrinaire like Randall, whose policy of protection is in accord with the republican party and leads to state socialism, or by statesmen like Cleveland and Mills, whose policy antagonizes that of the republicans and leads to equality of rights and individual liberty. The free trader, especially the single tax free trader, who would cast aside such an opportunity of dividing the two great parties on issues relating to labor and wages, and of saturating the politics of the future with economic thought, is more an enemy of the principles he professes than is the avowed protectionist.

## THE TARIFF REDUCTION BILL.

The committee of the whole of the house of representatives made some progress last week with the tariff bill as it came from the committee of ways and means. As the republicans insist on debating each line, and take a wide range in discussion, the progress is necessarily slow. The same old assertions are made about the influence of the tariff on the wages of labor, and there is practically little new in the discussion. It becomes clearer from day to day that the minority has no other object than to delay the final vote on the measure. The debate has thus far been confined to the clauses putting certain articles on the free list, and the expectation remains that after the tariff articles are reached the work will go on more rapidly. As the political campaign will practically be opened by the placing of the republican candidates for president and vice-president in the field, it is probable that the republican members of congress will soon find other opportunities for political activity, and cease their diabolical tactics.

One feature of the debate during last week was the reading of letters from protected manufacturers protesting against putting articles in which they are peculiarly interested on the free list. These letters abounded in wailing predictions of disaster to follow the cheapening of the prices of commodities to those engaged in other industries or to the people generally, and on the republican side of the house no voice was raised in behalf of the large number of industries and individuals to be benefited by the proposed changes. The democrats are making fewer speeches and steadily pressing each line of the bill to a vote, and on each vote they are succeeded by a fair and almost unvarying majority. Probably the most important contribution to the debate last week was the admission of Mr. Bayne, republican of Pennsylvania, who said:

It is perfectly evident to the members of this house, and it must now be evident to the people of the country, that this bill as reported from the committee will pass the house of representatives if the democratic party can muster the votes to put it through. It must be perfectly evident to the people of the country that they are to have this bill substantially in its present form. I believe that the only modifications proposed and agreed upon by the committee of ways and means are certain inconsequential amendments.

This admission, coming from a prominent protectionist, will be reassuring to those friends of tariff reduction who felt some natural alarm lest the concessions made by the committee for the purpose of gaining additional votes for the bill had materially weakened it as a measure looking toward free trade. If the amendments are, as Mr. Bayne declares, "inconsequential," free traders will not be disposed to severely criticize the committee of ways and means for its concessions.

The most remarkable feature of the proceedings last week was the determined effort of the protectionists to prevent the placing of tin plates on the free list. No such exhibition of irrational bigotry has been made before by the republicans. They admitted that no tin plates are now manufactured in this country, and that they are, to a numerous body of manufacturers, practically raw material, and yet they insisted that all the fruit and meat preservers, tinware manufacturers and tin roofers should be subjected to a senseless duty of thirty-five per cent on these plates for apparently no other reason than to protect the tinning of plates in this country, provided some persons yet

unknown should decide to engage in that industry, in the event of the Dakota tin mines turning out better than there is at present any reason to expect. The preposterous declaration was also made that the free admission of tin plates would ruin the sheet iron rolling mills, apparently by injuring the business of a smaller number of people engaged in making a poor iron roof that is only substituted for the tin because of the high price put on the latter by the tariff.

The whole discussion on this subject shows that the high tariff delusion has become a mere unreasoning superstition, founded on neither fact nor argument, and as unassassable by argument as a savage's belief in his fetish. The republican attitude on this question shows that there is no real desire to correct the most stupid inequalities and absurdities in the existing tariff, and that despite the declaration in their platform of four years ago, they are determined that no change shall be made that will lower duties on any article, no matter how great the surplus in the treasury may grow. This, at least, is the attitude of the great majority of the eastern republicans, and if their western brethren desire a different policy, they will have to get outside of the republican party in order to carry out their views. Those western congressmen who have not already broken loose from the policy of their party in the house are now being swept along into senseless opposition to all tariff reduction.

## COLORADO "OVERCROWDED."

The Denver Evening Times devotes nearly two columns to a report on the condition of labor in Colorado, which shows that that youthful state is already "overcrowded." One employment agency tells the reporter that they have found work for about 150 men recently and turned away from six to seven hundred. The manager of another agency says that the rate of wages there is now lower than it is in New York, and he advises outsiders to stay away unless they have money to invest in real estate. Another complains that some unprincipled persons in the east are circulating a report that teamsters can get three dollars a day in Colorado, whereas the fact is that they cannot get more than twenty dollars a month. Complaint is also made by the citizens generally that they are overrun by tramps, and a local report shows that on one day thirty and on the next day forty of these walking monstrosities to the efficacy of the protection of American industry were arrested for vagrancy in the city of Denver. The reporter testifies that many of these men are really willing to work, but that they can find nothing to do.

Eastern people, accustomed to what we call "overcrowding" here, may not at first take in the full significance of this statement. In 1880 the population of Colorado was less than two to the square mile, and its population has probably not doubled since that date. Think of it! A fertile state with great agricultural and mineral resources "overcrowded" with a population of four or five persons to the square mile! Migration to such a state ought to be the natural remedy for low wages in the east, and it ought to have the effect of securing good wages to those who migrate, but the land monopoly that shuts out men from natural opportunities for self employment, and the tariff that smothers and strangles agriculture, have done their perfect work and Colorado is "overcrowded."

Yet Colorado is represented in congress by men who uphold the party that so eagerly gave away the public domain to railway corporations and who insist on maintaining the tariff to further burden Colorado farmers. What a farce it is to talk of protection to American industry by a system that crowds the workman to the older settled portions of the country to the wall and refuses him escape to the industries of the sea while it closes against him the fertile plains of the west, "overcrowded" by a population of four or five to the square mile.

## NOTHING TO DO.

The Western steel works at St. Louis have ceased operations. This announcement is made by the Pittsburgh Chronicle Telegraph with the ominous statement that the works are not to begin operations again "until the fate of the Mills bill is decided," and that meantime the 1,500 employees whom the stoppage throws out of work will remain idle; all of which is due to "the disturbing effects of this bill." What an opportunity was lost to the protectionists when that sturdy and luxurious exemplar of the benefits of protection, Mr. Carnegie, closed his works before the Mills bill had an opportunity to get in its "disturbing effects!" Why did he not wait?

The Chicago fire was a godsend to many a bankrupt, who, after tottering for months on the slippery edge of insolvency, was able to point his creditors to the lurid flames and smoldering ruins of Chicago as the cause of his downfall. So manufacturers whose business falls a victim to the long era of protection which has made of them catpaws for landlords, are held up as awful examples of the effect of the Mills bill. The point of the argument is in its suggestion that free trade would throw men out of employment and keep them in idleness. The mere introduction of a partial free trade measure closes a big factory and deprives 1,500 men of work. Its passage would make less work still. The introduction of an outright free trade measure would cause more factories to close, and its passage would leave no work at all to be done. It would be like a self constructing, self operating, self repairing, universal wealth producing machine.

If protectionists take the American peo-

ple for fools, they are not to be blamed; the assumption is justified, since that kind of stuff has been made to do duty for argument all these years, and to walk without limping and stare without winking through all the literature with which protection leagues have deluged us. But if any of these fools *prima facie* will stop long enough to think, he will know it—it will not be an inference, he will know it—that free trade, instead of diminishing demand for products, will increase it, and that less manufacturing in the face of higher demand is a simple impossibility.

Free trade makes less work necessary to produce a given result, just as machinery does; but when that is followed by the impoverishment of any one it is not because free trade engenders poverty, but because natural opportunities for work are dearer—because another and more fundamental form of protection asserts itself.

Mr. George F. Elliott of Stamford, Conn., is the *Press*'s latest witness for protection. Mr. Elliott has met a man—an English tourist—and having obtained his views on the great tariff question hastens to give them to the world through the tariff talker of the *Press*. Here is the testimony:

"What wages did you earn in England?"  
"From \$7 to \$8 per week. While here I could earn for the same work from \$15 to \$18."  
"Is there much difference in the condition of the workingmen here and those in your country?"

"A vast deal of difference. You have better houses, better food and better clothing. In fact you people here in America don't want free trade or anything like it. I am not very well posted in your political affairs, but I am sure that what you do want here is a protective tariff."

Unfortunately, however, the honesty of the tariff talker is greater than his discretion. He not only gives us these opinions of the tourist, but he also communicates some facts regarding his personal history and condition, which, in a measure, detract from the value of his evidence. It appears that he was a cotton presser by trade, had been in the country for seven weeks without being able to get work at his trade or anything else, and described himself as being "not exactly on the tramp, but looking for work."

I landed at Boston with about \$60 in my pocket, and have spent my time here at Pawtucket, Lowell, Providence and several other places where they have mills, but could get no work."

"What is the reason they gave for not employing you?"

"They one and all said that the tariff agitation was causing a great depression in business, and they further say that if the no tariff bill passes your congress they will have to shut down entirely."

Perhaps, on the whole, the tariff talker had better call the next witness.

The Philadelphia *Times* claims that "we have too much of mineral raw material to make it judicious for us to build a wall around this country." So we have. Coal, iron, gold, silver, petroleum, copper, lime, salt, stone, natural gas, and so on through a long list; our land is full of them. They require but labor to bring them forth, labor to make the machinery to aid in bringing them forth, labor to transport them, and freedom to exchange them for raw material that our country does not offer, or finished products which we do not wish to make. To build a tariff wall around the country is to diminish the output of these minerals and to contract opportunities for employment in producing and transporting them and working them up. But a tariff wall around the mines is just as bad as a tariff wall around the country. There can be no real free trade in raw materials so long as the source of raw materials, the earth itself, is private property.

Every now and again we hear manufacturers complain that free trade would destroy their business. Manufacturers are pretty good calculators. They note the cost of materials, interest on capital, rent, wages, and so forth and so on, omitting not the smallest item, when considering the details of their business. But when considering the abolition of tariff they think only of the removal of duties from their own product, giving no thought to the fact that free trade abolishes duties on materials as well as on products. Every manufacturer can judge the effect of free trade on his business with fair accuracy, if he will take into the computation, first, the reduced prices at which he can sell at a profit if he gets his materials free, and, second, the greater number of sales he could make if he sold at the lower prices which free trade would permit.

The Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph thinks "the best thing" the democrats can do is to repeal the internal revenue taxes and let everything else alone," and it does not believe that Congressmen Doherty will live to see the enactment of his proposed law taxing all personal and corporate incomes above \$5,000 a year. To repeat the internal revenue laws is not the best thing the democratic party can do, but it is a good thing to do, all the same. The internal revenue laws, like the protective tariff laws, are burdens upon industry, promoting monopolies, subjugating labor, and forcing down wages; but the internal revenue laws are to the protective tariff laws as a Lilliputian to a Brobdingnagian. The best thing the democratic party can do just now, therefore, is to repeal the tariff laws, and not let everything else alone, but go right along from point to point until the whole system of protection, internal and external, is done away with. And in doing this Mr. Doherty's plan of taxing incomes need not and should not be adopted. That method is in line with the protection idea. It is part of the socialistic fungus of which protective tariffs are roots and suckers. The un-

qualified right of enjoying private property must be secured and maintained, and that right is not and never will be secured while whatever any man honestly earns is confiscated by taxation.

The Evening News of Detroit finds in the nomination of Thurman reason to believe that the democrats may carry Michigan. Thurman is in principle a "greenbacker," though he never belonged to the greenback party. He was one of the many leading men of the country whose influence in favor of the greenback idea was destroyed by third party men who persisted in making fealty to a mere organization the test of loyalty to a principle.

Free trade makes less work necessary to produce a given result, just as machinery does; but when that is followed by the impoverishment of any one it is not because free trade engenders poverty, but because natural opportunities for work are dearer—because another and more fundamental form of protection asserts itself.

Mr. George F. Elliott of Stamford, Conn., is the *Press*'s latest witness for protection. Mr. Elliott has met a man—an English tourist—and having obtained his views on the great tariff question hastens to give them to the world through the tariff talker of the *Press*. Here is the testimony:

"What wages did you earn in England?"  
"From \$7 to \$8 per week. While here I could earn for the same work from \$15 to \$18."

"Is there much difference in the condition of the workingmen here and those in your country?"

"A vast deal of difference. You have better houses, better food and better clothing. In fact you people here in America don't want free trade or anything like it. I am not very well posted in your political affairs, but I am sure that what you do want here is a protective tariff."

Unfortunately, however, the honesty of the tariff talker is greater than his discretion. He not only gives us these opinions of the tourist, but he also communicates some facts regarding his personal history and condition, which, in a measure, detract from the value of his evidence. It appears that he was a cotton presser by trade, had been in the country for seven weeks without being able to get work at his trade or anything else, and described himself as being "not exactly on the tramp, but looking for work."

I landed at Boston with about \$60 in my pocket, and have spent my time here at Pawtucket, Lowell, Providence and several other places where they have mills, but could get no work."

"What is the reason they gave for not employing you?"

"They one and all said that the tariff agitation was causing a great depression in business, and they further say that if the no tariff bill passes your congress they will have to shut down entirely."

Perhaps, on the whole, the tariff talker had better call the next witness.

The Philadelphia *Times* claims that "we have too much of mineral raw material to make it judicious for us to build a wall around this country." So we have. Coal, iron, gold, silver, petroleum, copper, lime, salt, stone, natural gas, and so on through a long list; our land is full of them. They require but labor to bring them forth, labor to make the machinery to aid in bringing them forth, labor to transport them, and freedom to exchange them for raw material that our country does not offer, or finished products which we do not wish to make. To build a tariff wall around the country is to diminish the output of these minerals and to contract opportunities for employment in producing and transporting them and working them up. But a tariff wall around the mines is just as bad as a tariff wall around the country. There can be no real free trade in raw materials so long as the source of raw materials, the earth itself, is private property.

Every now and again we hear manufacturers complain that free trade would destroy their business. Manufacturers are pretty good calculators. They note the cost of materials, interest on capital, rent, wages, and so forth and so on, omitting not the smallest item, when considering the details of their business. But when considering the abolition of tariff they think only of the removal of duties from their own product, giving no thought to the fact that free trade abolishes duties on materials as well as on products. Every manufacturer can judge the effect of free trade on his business with fair accuracy, if he will take into the computation, first, the reduced prices at which he can sell at a profit if he gets his materials free, and, second, the greater number of sales he could make if he sold at the lower prices which free trade would permit.

## MEN AND THINGS.

A hundred years ago Count Mirabeau epigrammatically said that there were but three ways of acquiring wealth,—by work, by gift, or by theft. A man who wants a thing must either make it, buy it, beg it, or steal it.

Modern ingenuity, however, has found another way of getting hold of property—at least, when the property desired is a railway, or a mine, or anything else belonging to a stock corporation. Like most other great discoveries, it's a very simple matter—when you understand it.

For example, here is the Richmond terminal company, a corporation owning in its own right a short and valuable piece of railroad, but controlling a large extent of connecting roads under lease. The problem is to get possession of the Richmond terminal property. The uninformed would say that the only thing to be done is to buy at least a majority of the stock of the company from those who own it.

The initiated, however, laugh that method to scorn, and adopt an easier plan. They wait until the time draws near when the transfer books of the company will be closed, previous to the annual election of directors. Then they lie them to Wall street, borrow a sufficient quantity of the stock for a day or two, have it registered in their own names, return it to the owner, with a bonus for its use, and when the day of election comes, vote themselves into control of a property in which they have it may be not a dollar of actual interest. It goes without saying that this method is not always absolutely sure of success, since when two or more parties want to get control of the same property the owners of stock may demand an exorbitant price for the lending of it; but that it has been practiced, and to an alarmingly great extent, is matter of common fame in Wall street.

Now to put an end to this sort of thing is a question which the governing committee of the stock exchange are now considering. The matter was brought to their attention by a letter from one firm of brokers, complaining that another firm of brokers had borrowed from them a thousand shares of Richmond terminal stock, and used it in the manner described, at the recent annual election of directors. When the lenders of the stock received it back they found it had been registered in the name of the borrowers, and when they applied to the latter for a proxy to enable them to vote at the election, they were informed that "according to usage on the stock exchange no proxy is due on stock borrowed over the closing of the books."

It seems by no means certain that the stock exchange committee can do anything to remedy this, for any regulation they may make will be easily evaded if both parties are willing to evade it. It is already a statutory crime, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for any person to vote on stock of which he is not either the actual owner or the representative of the owner; and any inspector of election, at the annual meeting of any New York corporation, may require any proxy voter to swear, under penalty of perjury, that the person he represents is, to the best of his knowledge, the bona fide owner of the stock voted on. It would be difficult for the stock exchange to pass a more stringent law than this, or to enforce it with a severer penalty.

The simple truth is that neither a legislature nor a governing committee can make men virtuous by mere prohibitory enactments. If public sentiment attaches no stigma of disgrace to the doing of something which men find it profitable to do, that thing will continue to be done, all the laws on the statute book to the contrary notwithstanding; and the only effect of the most stringent law will be to make men skillful in concealment. Thus usury laws become dead letters, excise laws are openly violated, and men, who in all ordinary relations of life are absolutely truthful, calmly purify themselves to evade the robbery of the protective tariff. If the stock exchange people want to put an end to such questionable methods of acquiring property as that we have described, they must make it scandalous for men to use them. And that they can never do so long as the greed of gain is fostered and men are urged to the pursuit of wealth by that social injustice which degrades that out of every thousand American citizens born into this country a certain number must, of necessity, pass their lives in poverty.

Who was it that invented, years ago, the fiction of the lawyer who, being consulted by a client who had embezzled a comparatively trifling sum, advised him to take as much as he could lay hands on, compromise matters by returning a portion, and keep the balance? The story used to be thought ingenious, but absurd. Yet it is what has actually happened in the case of the defaulting paying teller of the Manhattan company and his counsel. The former having suffered from the bank sums aggregating about \$10,000, went to Lawyer Dunn for advice. Dunn examined authorities, thought the matter over, and then advised Mr. Scott to take a million and five—"take enough to cripple the bank, so that they'll be glad to compromise," was Dunn's expression. Scott took the advice in part, stole \$160,000, gave the most of it to Dunn to take care of him, and vanished into Canada, whence he shortly went to London.

Then a curious situation developed itself. The defaulter in London was urgently trying to get some money out of Lawyer Dunn, who was, after fashion, trustee for all concerned. The Manhattan company also wanted money, and showed a charitable disposition to condone Scott's offense if only he would pay some reasonable sum, say, \$30,000 to \$60,000. And Lawyer Dunn, rising to the possibilities of the occasion, announced that he had lost the money, and defied everybody. This was short sighted of Mr. Dunn, and illustrated the truth of the proverb about the man who tries to be his own lawyer. For the bank, finding it impossible to get any money out of anybody, was eager for revenge; and Mr. Scott, finding it impossible for him to get any money, became rather anxious than otherwise to

sacrifice Mr. Dunn upon the altar of justice. And so the end of it all is that ex-teller Scott is free but penniless, lawyer Dunn is a convict but comparatively rich, and the Manhattan company has had the satisfaction of getting square to a certain extent. It is a very pretty episode of modern commercial life.

For observe, that the Manhattan officials are only less guilty than the other criminals. They have deliberately attempted to compound a felony. Had Dunn been willing to surrender \$50,000 of the money in his hands he might be a free man today. And indeed it seems not at all unlikely that he has deliberately chosen to serve his term in prison rather than give up any of the cash. That he should have had the option is the fault of the Manhattan company.

Chauncey M. Depew, while on his way to the Chicago convention, stopped over at Syracuse to deliver an address before the graduating class of the medical college of that city. Mr. Depew's speeches are always pleasant to read, if only for the shrewd humor in them; but this particular address is especially interesting, because in it the speaker turned the serious side of his nature outward, and showed the world how the life problems of this nineteenth century present themselves to a man who in his own person has achieved a marked success—who has not only conquered fortune and become rich, but has also managed to acquire the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens in a marked degree.

In the very beginning of his address, Mr. Depew compressed into a single paragraph a whole cyclopedia of economics:

The vocation chosen by a young man is governed by accident or inclination. But the manner in which it is pursued is controlled neither by luck nor chance. The liberal professions are crowded with incompetents. I know ministers who should be palace car conductors, poor lawyers who would have been good drummers or clerks, and medical men who are more dangerous to their patients than the diseases they treat, who were designed by nature for the farm or the factory. The world is a workshop full of misfits, and misfits are always cheap. It requires both faculty and courage when you have discovered your mistake to drop your tools and start again. But if all the doctors, lawyers and ministers who never can get into their professions would get out and find other fields of labor, it would be infinitely better for themselves and the country. A living stream of new applicants for public favor and support pours through the portals of the schools of medicine, law and theology. It is estimated that doctors are thus manufactured in such large numbers that they form one to every three hundred inhabitants. At first view this seems very discouraging, but the situation has many compensations. So many are wholly unfit or badly prepared, that while they increase the miseries of mankind, they add to the business and profits of those who are capable. The competitions of modern life have become so keen that there are no opportunities for the lame and the lazy. The first must find their proper pursuits, and the second must work or go to the wall.

This is all very fine; but it tempts one to ask what the lame man is to do who can find no room in his proper pursuit, and what the lazy man is to do when nobody will furnish him with work. Mr. Depew must know well full that there are myriads of men who would gladly be palace car conductors, or drummers, or clerks, or farmers, or factory hands, and are sufficiently well qualified for those callings, but who are absolutely shut out from them by a decree as inexorable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. And why should a young man, in choosing his vocation, be governed by accident rather than inclination? Why should the boy beginning life be compelled to ask, What can I get to do? rather than, What can I do best? These are questions which apparently find no place in Mr. Depew's economic philosophy. But they are questions that demand an answer all the same.

This little anecdote and the comment on it which Mr. Depew interjected into his address show how clearly he understands the bottom principle of protection:

In no state or country has the progress of your profession been more remarkable than in New York. While searching the records of this Dutch colony for another purpose, I found this historically valuable entry under date of February 5, 1652:

"The colonial council order that ship's doctors arriving at the port of New Amsterdam shall not be permitted to practice medicine or surgery without the consent of Dr. La Montaigne." The good doctor was the only physician on Manhattan Island. Orders of the council were equivalent to statutes, and this was the law first for the protection of American industry ever passed on this continent.

In the midst of the heated controversies of the hour on this great question, you gentlemen may congratulate yourselves that the father of American medicine was also the founder of our protective system. One hundred years after, in 1753, King's college, in New York, had a medical department, and Dr. John Jones, its professor of surgery, published a work upon field hospitals and the treatment of the wounded, which was the text book of the staff during the revolutionary war, and its suggestions were adopted by the army surgeons of the veteran armies of Europe. Now it is the just pride of our state that its medical colleges in equipment and instruction compare favorably with the world famed schools of Vienna, London and Paris.

Evidently Mr. Depew is satisfied that Dr. John Jones' text book would never have been written, and still less would our medical colleges have been comparable with those of Europe, had not Dr. La Montaigne been protected in his monopoly of practice on Manhattan Island. This opens up a whole vista of possibilities. If our medical profession will only have the good sense to cut loose from the rest of the world altogether—to forbid the importation of foreign doctors, foreign drugs and foreign medical works and periodicals, absolutely, to what dizzy heights of healing may they not attain? Indeed, on this principle, Podunk Four Corners, with its single doctor, may become a center of medical science, by the simple process of forbidding any other physician to settle within its limits.

St. Louis is to have a charity organization society of its own—a central bureau to which kindly disposed citizens can refer cases of distress and applicants for alms. Registry books are to be opened, in which the names of applicants for relief will be entered with the report of the association's inspectors on each case. In this way it is

expected that the pauper class will be thoroughly sifted, the undeserving left to starve, and the meritorious poor relieved to just that moderate extent that will keep them from perishing, without making life too pleasant for them. Several clergymen, two or three local missionaries and a few philanthropic ladies are among the organizers, and the wealthy citizens of St. Louis are being actively canvassed for members.

It is a queer comment on modern Christianity that the ministers of Him who bade his followers do their alms in secret, not letting their right hands know the gifts bestowed with their left, should find it necessary to uphold, and even to join such an organization as this. It makes one wonder whether the character of the alms-seeking class has changed in the last eighteen hundred years, or whether this precept of the Master, like his utterances from the Mount, is to be accepted with the reservation that He didn't mean what He said. The teaching that the poor we have always with us is accepted as a sufficiently explicit condemnation of any effort to abolish poverty; but when it comes to relieving the distresses of the poor it appears that modern wisdom must supplement the new testament, and that to obey the letter of the scripture would be to strike a blow at the foundations of society.

This, however, is a matter which the charity organizers must settle with their own consciences. If the modern good Samaritan, instead of oil and wine, chooses to give the sufferer by the wayside a ticket on the Samaritan organization society, he has a perfect right to do so. But it may be suggested to the advocates of charity organization that their methods are very apt to be self defeating; and that in endeavoring to separate the deserving from the undeserving they may be really placing a premium upon deception, just as a custom house offers a reward for successful perjury. To an adroit and calculating swindler, system in charity may be help rather than a hindrance. He knows just what dangers he has to provide against or avoid and can lay his plans accordingly. It is, in fact, an application of the competitive examination principle, in which the reward is an easy living at other people's cost.

And yet the organizers of the St. Louis society are, most of them at least, no doubt sincerely good and earnest men and women. The distress they see about them troubles them, and will not let them rest. They feel they must do something; they know by experience that indiscriminate alms giving is the fruitful parent of pauperism; and they organize their charity because that seems the only thing left for them to do. To tell them that no amount of alms giving, no efficiency of organization, can do more than to lift some men out of poverty at the cost of thrusting other men into poverty, would seem to them like blasphemy. For in spite of all their misinterpretations of economic and religious principles, they instinctively revolt against the pretense that God, or nature, or the fitness of things, demands that men shall live in poverty whether they will or no. Confronted with the grim social paradox, they turn away their faces, and muttering that it cannot be refused to gaze upon the horrid thing. The first must find their proper pursuits, and the second must work or go to the wall.

This is all very fine; but it tempts one to ask what the lame man is to do who can find no room in his proper pursuit, and what the lazy man is to do when nobody will furnish him with work. Mr. Depew must know well full that there are myriads of men who would gladly be palace car conductors, or drummers, or clerks, or farmers, or factory hands, and are sufficiently well qualified for those callings, but who are absolutely shut out from them by a decree as inexorable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. And why should a young man, in choosing his vocation, be governed by accident rather than inclination? Why should the boy beginning life be compelled to ask, What can I get to do? rather than, What can I do best? These are questions which apparently find no place in Mr. Depew's economic philosophy. But they are questions that demand an answer all the same.

This little anecdote and the comment on it which Mr. Depew interjected into his address show how clearly he understands the bottom principle of protection:

In no state or country has the progress of your profession been more remarkable than in New York. While searching the records of this Dutch colony for another purpose, I found this historically valuable entry under date of February 5, 1652:

"The colonial council order that ship's doctors arriving at the port of New Amsterdam shall not be permitted to practice medicine or surgery without the consent of Dr. La Montaigne." The good doctor was the only physician on Manhattan Island. Orders of the council were equivalent to statutes, and this was the law first for the protection of American industry ever passed on this continent.

In the midst of the heated controversies of the hour on this great question, you gentlemen may congratulate yourselves that the father of

American medicine was also the founder of our protective system. One hundred years after, in 1753, King's college, in New York, had a medical department, and Dr. John Jones, its professor of surgery, published a work upon field hospitals and the treatment of the wounded, which was the text book of the staff during the revolutionary war, and its suggestions were adopted by the army surgeons of the veteran armies of Europe. Now it is the just pride of our state that its medical colleges in equipment and instruction compare favorably with the world famed schools of Vienna, London and Paris.

Evidently Mr. Depew is satisfied that Dr. John Jones' text book would never have been written, and still less would our medical colleges have been comparable with those of Europe, had not Dr. La Montaigne been protected in his monopoly of practice on Manhattan Island. This opens up a whole vista of possibilities. If our medical profession will only have the good sense to cut loose from the rest of the world altogether—to forbid the importation of foreign doctors, foreign drugs and foreign medical works and periodicals, absolutely, to what dizzy heights of healing may they not attain? Indeed, on this principle, Podunk Four Corners, with its single doctor, may become a center of medical science, by the simple process of forbidding any other physician to settle within its limits.

St. Louis is to have a charity organization society of its own—a central bureau to which kindly disposed citizens can refer cases of distress and applicants for alms. Registry books are to be opened, in which the names of applicants for relief will be entered with the report of the association's inspectors on each case. In this way it is

expectedly successful, not a single package having been lost by seizure.

At the recent annual meeting of the Land nationalization society of Great Britain, the president, Alfred Russell Wallace, epitomised the British industrial situation as follows:

"It is about fifty years since Hood's famous 'Song of the Shirt' started the world with its revelation of hopeless misery. But what would Hood have said if he could have heard the revelations now being made of shirts made at 12¢ each, the worker, by continuous hard work, making twelve shirts a day, and earning 6¢ a week, and with the rent of an attic at least double what it was in his time. Five years ago we had the 'bitter cry' excitement, and a commission of inquiry, and a huge report. Then another commission on depression of trade and another report—and now another commission or committee on the 'sweating system'—to be followed no doubt by another report, which, like the preceding reports, will be simply a much waste paper. The reason why commissions and reports do no good is because our politicians and our philanthropists will never search for real causes, will never go to the root of the matter, which is, in one word, landlordism, that system of land monopoly which treats the land of the country as a means of profit for landlord and farmer, that profit being got with the minimum of labor on the land. An attempt is now being made to put the public on a wrong scent by imputing all the misery of our city workers to the competition of foreigners. I do not say this has no effect; it is no doubt an aggravating cause, and so long as we cannot keep our people from starving it should be stopped; but it is as nothing compared with the real fundamental cause—the driving of the rural population from the country to the great towns. Year after year farmers, under the pressure of the exorbitant rents of the period of commercial prosperity which culminated in 1872, are becoming first impoverished, then bankrupt, and landlords are turning their arable land into pasture, so as to get the maximum of profit with the minimum of outlay and risk, and thus a constant stream of laborers, and with them village mechanics and shopkeepers, are forced to migrate to the towns. The consequence is that we have at this moment two-thirds of our whole population—more than twenty million people—concentrated in the great cities and towns, while millions of acres of our land all over the country are less populated and less effectively cultivated than fifty years ago. Yet when this fact was brought before them last week by Mr. Bradlaugh, our legislators, men who profess to be our representatives, walked out of the house of commons till, there being only fifteen members present, the debate collapsed in a count-out! In the course of the debate we had the usual statement that the land was uncultivated, because it could not be cultivated at a profit. No doubt the landlord, having ruined the farmers by making them pay exorbitant rents, cannot find tenants for his farms, but this very same land could be cultivated at a profit by laborers and their families, even paying the same rent as the farmers paid, if they had the land in such quantities as they required, and with absolute security of tenure. That they can and do this—cultivate it and live comfortably on it—has been shown again and again, though the fact is always denied in parliament. The reports of the agricultural commission prove it. The landlord apologist, the Hon. Mr. Broderick, proves it in his book 'English Lands and English Landlords.' I myself have collected ample evidence of it in my books on 'Land Nationalization' and 'Bad Times,' as has Mr. Incey in his 'Three Acres and a Cow' and his 'Housed Beggars.' In this last pamphlet he shows that on a farm taken by a working-men's allotment association in Northamptonshire, forty men are employed where only four men were employed by the farmer, the result being that wheat produced forty-eight bushels an acre, nearly double the farmer's average! And this land is cultivated, not by men who have been farm laborers only, but by small tradesmen, green grocers, dairymen, mechanics, etc., showing that men brought up in the country in the midst of agriculture have both a love of it and a knowledge of it sufficient to enable them to cultivate land at a profit. Now if we could take a census of the unemployed and stringing workers in London and other great cities, we should find that perhaps one-third, perhaps half of them, were country born, and would go back to their native villages if they had a fair chance. Once throw the land open to them, giving them the choice of a place to live in, with absolute security of tenure, and not only would the immigration from the cities be stopped, but an outflow would begin from them to the country which would have the most beneficial effects, both on the production of food, the decrease of poverty, and the progress of trade. Now this I hold to be the great purpose and use of land nationalization, to get the people back on to the land, to check the growth of great cities, and to produce on our own soil the many millions sterling worth of eggs, poultry, butter, cheese, bacon, and fruit now imported, but which we can easily grow ourselves. Even the importation of wheat would be greatly diminished, for when laborers grow wheat by choice as they frequently do, we may be sure that it pays them to grow it, the reason being that they grow from 40 to 50 bushels an acre, while the farmer under a landlord grows from 20 to 30 only.

By some strange perversion of intelligence, Dr. Wallace, after thus clearly tracing the cause of poverty to the monopolization of the natural opportunities, proposes by way of remedy that the landlords, without reducing their claims for rent, should simply be required to let their agricultural land in smaller parcels! This, he thinks—or at all events, he says—would be far better than to abolish landlordism altogether by taxing land values; because, in the latter case, land would still be cultivated by farmers, who would employ as few laborers as possible, and avail themselves of the competition among laborers to keep down wages. "On the other hand, if laborers of all kinds had free access to land on the most favorable terms and conditions, they would get almost all they could get by the most thorough land nationalization, since it would not matter to them to whom they paid their rents." This is certainly the most amazing piece of logic that was ever heard outside a lunatic asylum.

Dr. Wallace need only have turned his eyes from the fields to the cities to discover how, as men are driven from the country to the city, land values fall in the former and rise in the latter. Here, for instance, is an account, extracted from the *London Star*, of the system on which the recently expired leases on the Portman estate in London are being renewed:

For a forty years' lease a house worth £200 a year would be let for £50 and a premium of £1,400, the tenant putting on an extra story and modernizing the house—i.e.,

putting in plate glass windows, raising the ceilings, draining and repairing.

For a twenty-five years' lease, rent and premium are the same, and the tenant only modernizes and repairs, the "extra story" being omitted.

For a seven, fourteen or twenty-one years' lease the tenant repairs at a rack rent.

In addition to these conditions, a fee of two guineas has to be paid by the tenant before he can even know on what terms he may renew. How completely the system concretes every farthing of improvement may be judged by the experience of a certain Mrs. Weatherley, who in 1880 took a shop on a lease, with eight years to run, spent £200 on it straightway, and then—thinking, foolish creature, that she had made a special claim on the consideration of her landlord—sound her agent his agent to the terms of renewal. She had made such a claim. She had improved his property. She was accordingly informed that she could have the lease renewed in 1888 by paying £50 round rent in place of £10, and by paying down at once a premium of £1,600, or interest on that sum at five percent, which of course amounted to a fresh rent in addition to that which was demanded. Those who are interested in the history of torture may, if they please, follow the record of Mrs. Weatherley's struggles on the rack on which Viscount Portman and his agent stretched her during the eight years of her occupancy. It is enough to say that on the principle of getting £8,000 for every £1,000 of rent formerly paid by his tenants, Lord Portman may now fairly reckon that he draws a million and a quarter in premiums from the industry of the traders of Baker street and the neighborhood.

And be it remembered, every one of these houses as it now exists has been built by a previous tenant—the owner of the "Portman estate" has never done anything but simply to allow other people to improve his land, and dutifully present him with the improvements at the expiration of their leases.

If Dr. Wallace could succeed in transplanting a third of the city dwellers to agricultural lands now disused, the only effect would be to diminish city rental values, and raise those of agricultural lands; to lessen the incomes of city landlords, and increase the incomes of rural landowners. For wherever men may be congregated, they must obtain the use of natural opportunities or die. And as "all that a man hath, will he give for his life," the monopolizers of God's life supporting bounty can squeeze from their helpless victims, whether in city or country, all they have or earn, save only bare subsistence.

## MR. CARNEGIE'S HOLIDAY.

**He Recommends Everyone to Spend His Vacation in a Coaching Trip.**

The *Pall Mall Gazette* enjoyed the privilege

## LOUIS PRANG.

## A PROTECTED MANUFACTURER WHO DECLares FOR FREE TRADE,

And Plants Himself Upon the American Doctrine of Equal Rights and No Favors.

Louis Prang, the great Boston manufacturer of fine colored lithographs and oil prints, stands at the head of his business in this country, if not in the world. His energy and fine artistic instinct have enabled him not only to build up a manufacture which, in some of its branches, is unequalled even in Europe, but to do much to popularize the taste for art. Instead of joining in the ranks of the lithographers for more protection, Mr. Prang has written a letter to the *American Lithographer and Printer*, in which, both as a manufacturer and an American citizen, he declares against protection in toto. As to his own business, Mr. Prang says:

Does any one believe that with our intelligence, our skill, our energy, our printing presses, we are not a match for all Europe as far as the great bulk of the business is concerned? Free trade prices of materials and machinery would add considerably to our ability, not only to hold, but to increase our markets.

The foreign manufacturers of goods similar to those which I produce have always under sold me in this market, and yet my business has prospered. I saw that European manufacturers did not understand all the requirements of this market, and that there was an opportunity for me to make a use of goods that should be distinctively American. Instead, therefore, of undertaking to imitate what was well done in Europe and then expect the government to protect me in my imitations, I appealed to American intelligence, to American skill, and to American artists for original work, and thus built up a business independent of protection, and have sold my goods largely in foreign markets by reason of their individual qualities. My business, therefore, has had no help from protection; it has been built up in spite of protection, and if our protective policy had not to a certain extent shut me out of the markets of the world by artificially enhancing the cost of my products, and by largely abrogating the inter-communication with distant nations, my business could have been greatly increased and I could have employed a much larger number of workmen.

When I find that I cannot pursue my business in this legitimate way; when I find it will not hold its own under natural conditions, I shall give it up. Certain it is, I shall not be found whining about Washington getting the lobby to influence legislation in my favor against the interests of the nation at large.

As to the general principle Mr. Prang is no less emphatic. He says:

Imagine that your labor was invested in producing butter, and that you desired to take pay for the surplus of your butter in eggs belonging to a stranger, and that a third party should step between you two and command you to stop your intended exchange until you had paid to him a toll—say of fifty per cent of the value of the eggs, at the same time promising to return that toll to you through various circuitous channels, not easily to be explained? What would you think of such an interference and of such a promise? This is precisely what protection is doing for us in almost every trade transaction we have with a foreign nation.

Trade is the missionary of peace. Obstructing trade means estrangement—the creation of jealousy, of narrow selfishness, of inimical feelings; it leads away from peace. The more that nations exchange the products of the labor of their people, the more their interests become interwoven, the more they become interdependent upon one another, and thus the guarantees of peace between them become greater. Our nation being in a position to lead the world by good example, should never champion a policy below the aspirations of that freedom which the genius of the founders of this republic bequeathed to us as a birth-right to be kept sacred and undefiled. Freedom in all directions should be our watchword; any policy leading away from it breeds mischief and eventually war.

Carry protection out to its logical end by applying it not only to the nation against all other nations, but to one nation against all other states, one city against all other cities, and at last to the family against all other families, and it will not be difficult to picture the effects of such a course to which the history of the middle ages furnishes examples. Now make the same test with the principles of free trade, and it will not be difficult for you to see that the result must be a lifting up of each individual man and of the nation itself into a higher civilization.

Protection may have fostered a few old industries and created a number of new ones; but at what a terrible cost! It has to a great degree emasculated our industrial life, it has taken out of it the spirit, the freedom, the character. It has depressed the aspiration to make the best goods in the world and to rely on their excellence to sell them in all markets. It has narrowed the aims of a great industrial people from the world's market down to the home market. It has by contracting the field of operation, facilitated the creation of monopolies, combines and trusts. It has killed our proud merchant navy, once the glory of our nation. It has un-Americanized us by making narrow, selfish views dominant, where the fathers of this republic proudly declared that a broad humanity should be the leading principle of American civilization.

We have given up the industrial leadership of the world. We have given up the carrying trade of the world. We have given up our manhood as fearless, independent workers. We have given up the ideas embodied in the Declaration of Independence pointing toward the highest and broadest humanity. Under the impulse of these grand humanitarian ideas slavery was abolished at the cost of a frightful war, which left an enormous debt. To meet this moral obligation, tariff duties were resorted to as a principal means of raising revenue; and when the national exigency had passed and the revenue from this source increased beyond any legitimate needs, the reason for continuing these taxes for purposes of revenue was shifted to taxes for industrial protection; and under this latter name they are now being advocated as of great benefit to the whole nation, and as an insatiable boon to the American workingmen in particular. Alas! stripped of its fine verbiage, tariff for protection is but a survival of the system of robbing Peter to aggrandize Paul.

Over production in this country, the bugbear of our industrial era, is an anomaly where so many men and women are suffering for the want of these accumulations of industrial wealth. It is an evidence that the opportunities for work are artificially closed up somehow. If protection had increased the opportunities for profitable labor, as claimed by the protectionists, then the million now starving would be in a position to earn wages which they could offer in exchange, and relieve that stagnation in circulation and dis-

tribution which is unfitly named over production.

Protection, by narrowing our market, by raising artificially all our living and manufacturing expenses is, no doubt, one of the great causes of this disease which is breeding congestion in our social organism. Free exchange would act like free air and sunshine; it would purify and invigorate our industrial atmosphere.

Protection means simply protection to the manufacturers of certain commodities. Labor is not protected at all. While the manufacturer has foreign manufactured goods taxed for his benefit, the workingman finds himself completely exposed to the competition of the workingmen of the whole world, who come in duty free.

This policy has greatly aided to create the tramp and the million of able-bodied working-men and women, who for want of work in this blessed land, are always on the point of starvation. It has facilitated the creation of monopolies and trusts, and the more monopolies and trusts the more destruction of small manufacturers and tradesmen, the more dependence and uncertainty for the workingman, the less opportunity for profitable labor, and in consequence the more idle men and women. These idle men and women are dead to trade as consumers, but they are a living source for immorality, intemperance and depression of wages.

If protection has anything to do with the difference between the wages in Europe and America, what causes the great difference in wages in different parts of the United States? Our industries enjoy the same protection in one state as in another, and yet the wages in every single industry, west, east, north and south, differ as much as one hundred per cent from the lowest to the highest. Not so much in our industry of lithography, it is true; but still enough to show that protection has nothing to do with the rate of wages.

If protection could secure higher wages, then the best protected countries should be the eldorado for the workingman. But it happens that hordes of starving workmen from the best protected country in Europe, Italy, overflow each spring the border line of free trade Switzerland, to perform there the lowest grade of work for wages which the free trading Swiss allow them to enjoy without jealousy and without fear of competition. Canada, the well protected, offers us with like incursions, and Germany's working classes do not seem to have reached the acme of their happiness since the advent of their manifold protective system, judging from the number in Castle garden on the arrival of every German steamer. The fact is that their wages have not increased even in the ratio of their living expenses, but their poverty has.

No, it is not protection which gives our workingmen better wages than in Europe; it is the fact that the opportunities for labor here are not yet quite so contracted, and that our workingmen have still preserved a sufficient amount of the energy and spirit of the freeman, in spite of protection, to resist more successfully the encroachments of capital and monopoly.

Protection is a policy of spoliation of the masses in the interest of a limited class, and the regulating of the industrial affairs of the individual citizen, which protection attempts by prescribing through taxes which industries shall be fostered and which restricted, is exactly what the socialists claim should be done, with this difference, that the plan of the socialist is more clearly and logically prepared, and seems to favor less distinction of classes in its aims and method. To move on these lines, therefore, by the state sets an example of a very dangerous tendency, sustaining the teachings of the socialists that our working people must look to state socialism as a means of bettering their general condition. Protection is also a policy of demoralization. With the establishment of the first custom house, an insidious poison entered our national life. The custom house has made us proverbial scoffers at the sanctity of an oath, and tariff taxation has degraded us from the position of self-reliant freemen to the abject condition of industrial cowards, crying and begging like babes for more protection against the very nations we are so fond of dreading as beneath us in the social scale.

Now, I do not believe that free trade will bring us the millennium or free the workingman from all the shackles that capital, monopoly and landlordism have clamped upon him; nor do I believe that the advantages a free trade policy would bring to him would be lasting without other reforms sadly needed in our social organization; but I believe that free trade is necessary as a leader, to be followed by these other reforms, as it will secure to the workingman a full and just share of the wealth he helps to create and assure to him an ever present opportunity for profitable labor.

Then we will have men in our industries of higher social and industrial ideals and of unconquerable faith in freedom. Then the workingman will regard himself the peer of the highest and best in the land; he will fear no competitor and will regard every other workingman, no matter where placed, as his associate and brother. Then will American industry partake of the broad, self-reliant character of such citizenship; then will it control the markets of the world by virtue of the intrinsic worth of its products. Industrial supremacy, even in our home market, on any other basis, would be unworthy of the American character.

The Mills bill points in the direction of greater social freedom, and therefore, and therefore only, it deserves our best support.

## Spreading the Light.

Louis Lesaulnier of Red Bud, Illinois, has been for some years one of the most active of our workers, and has circulated hundreds of books, thousands of tracts and many copies of *The Standard*—all of which he keeps constantly in his store—to sell to those who will buy, and to give or lend to those who, though they will not buy, will read. That he is not afraid to avow his principles, his business card shows. Here it is:

**LOUIS LESAULNIER,**  
**DRUGGIST,**  
**RED BUD (Randolph County), ILLINOIS.**

Keeps Free Circulating Library of all of Henry George's Publications, See Other Side.

(Other Side)

Equal right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness includes equal rights to all natural opportunities. When these possess a rent value, justice demands that we pay it in full as a tax for the privilege to monopolize them against the equal rights of our fellow men.

Our present land and tax laws bring about industrial slavery, etc., in proportion to the number of undesirable lands.

Henry George's single tax will free labor and capital from all other taxes, it will induce the best use of desirable land, it will secure a labor and capital its proper reward, it will make noble and free men out of communities and nations now blind and foolishly legislating and fighting against each other.

The best government grants its people the fullest amount of liberty compatible with justice and safety.

## FREE TRADE THE AMERICAN IDEA.

F. M. Holland in the Freethinker's Magazine.

One of the first results of independence was the abolition of the British system of restrictions on commerce between the colonies and establishment of free trade throughout an area which long ago became larger than all Europe, and now extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Pitt's attempt to open similar traffic between Great Britain and Ireland failed in 1785, when the demands of English manufacturers to be protected against Irish cheap labor were supported by Burke, Fox and Sheridan.

Among the very few who wished, a hundred years ago, to enable all nations to trade freely were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Albert Gallatin and Pelatiah Webster. In 1774, two years earlier than Smith's "Wealth of Nations," appeared the "Principles of Trade," which was largely due to Franklin's pen, and was recommended by him for circulation here in 1784. The wish is expressed, "that commerce were as free between all nations of the world as it is between the several counties of England." "No nation was ever ruined by trade, even seemingly the most disadvantageous."

In a letter of 1788 Franklin expressed his expectation that American tariffs would be for revenue only. Jefferson was then advocating free trade, as minister to France, and in 1783 he recommended, as secretary of the treasury, that commerce "be relieved of its shackles in all parts of the world." "Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free exchange, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation." Gallatin appeared soon after as an opponent of protection in congress. Pelatiah Webster, a graduate of Yale, who was imprisoned for patriotism by the British in 1778, published the next year an essay, saying, "Take off every restraint and limitation from our commerce. Let trade be as free as air. Let every man make the most of his goods, and in his own way." In 1783 he suggested that revenue should be raised mainly by duties on luxuries, for instance, high priced tea and cloth, while necessities should be taxed but five per cent; and the tariff of 1789 was in much closer harmony with his principles than that now in force, especially as the average rate of duties was less than one-fifth of the present amount.

Heavy duties for revenue only were kept upon coffee until 1822, and upon tea until 1842, while the attempts of what was called the British faction to increase the imports of manufactures were resisted by northerners as well as southerners, on the ground that no taxes for the benefit of the few should be imposed on the many. Daniel Webster helped defeat the efforts to high duties on cotton and woolen goods in 1816, when a protectionist member of congress named Gold, sought to justify himself by quoting Brougham, Sir James Stewart, and the "Parliamentary History." The example of Great Britain was appealed to in 1820, together with that of France, Prussia, Holland, Italy and Russia, by protectionists, who admitted that they were asking for a radical change in the tariff, and that it had thus far been levied "more to aid the treasury than to protect industry." They were opposed by representatives from Massachusetts and Connecticut, who not only showed the danger of losing foreign markets and diverting capital into unprofitable industries, but urged that if the channel of trade were left free it would find its proper level with mutual benefit. The Salem merchants sent in a memorial, drawn by Judge Story, and protesting against the proposed duties as "repugnant to those maxims of free trade, which the United States have hitherto so forcibly and perseveringly contended for as the sure foundation of national prosperity."

Protection was only a secondary object of legislation before 1824, when it was made paramount by close votes. Clay's assertion that the (protective) bill would "lay the foundation of a genuine American policy" was answered by Webster thus: "This, sirs, is an assumption which I take the liberty most directly to dispute. Since the言 of the proposed measure as a new era in our legislation, since he proposes us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished nations, one is a little anxious to know with what propriety of speech this invention of other nations is denominated an 'American policy,' while on the contrary, a preference for our own established system, as it now actually exists, and always has existed, is called a 'foreign policy.'" Mr. Webster wished "freedom of trade to be the general principle, and restriction the exception;" and added: "There is a country, not uniuscinated among the nations, in which the progress of manufactures has been far more rapid than in any other, and yet unaided by prohibitory or unnatural restrictions. That country, the happiest which the sun shines on, is our own."

The majority of New England's representatives opposed the protective tariff of 1824 and also that of 1828. The latter gave rise to the free trade convention in Philadelphia in 1831 on a call first published in the *Evening Post*, then edited by Bryant. Prominent among the delegates from fifteen states was Gallatin, who had been secretary of the treasury from 1801 to 1813. Chief Justice Marshall was also present. The surplus of our revenue, in consequence of the reduction of \$146, was found to be a sufficient reason for a still greater reduction in 1837. At the presidential election the year previous not one of the four principal candidates stood on a protectionist platform. The democrats repeated for the fourth time their pledge in 1840 against fostering any branch of industry to the detriment of another, or raising more revenue "than is required to defray the necessary expenses." The latter position had been taken by the free soilers also in 1832.

Even in 1862 Emerson spoke at Washington, in Lincoln's presence, of "Free trade, certainly the interest of nations, but by no means the interest of certain towns and districts which tariff feeds fat, and the eager interest of which overpowers the apathetic general conviction of the many." Bryant was able for more than fifty years to teach the truth that "Free trade is a part of the grand movement of mankind toward a nobler condition of social existence."

These examples, with those of Franklin, Jefferson, Story, and Webster, when at his best, should encourage us to make all our commercial relations as freely and fully American as those between our states.

**A Unionist's View of the Irish Situation.**

BALTIMORE, Ireland, June 10.—As a simile tax man and unionist, will you kindly allow me a few words in reply to Mr. J. Dawson?

With his first letter I agree. The leaders of the nationalist party seem to have gone altogether astray. Ireland wants her land question settled, and the majority of her representatives want to make the confusion existing on that question worse confounded. They would, if they had the power, land us into peasant proprietorship to-morrow. The great hope for Ireland is the growth of

sound ideas of taxation among the British democracy. Therefore (and here I evidently part company with Mr. Dawson), I am a unionist. When we have our land in our own hands it will be time enough to see about home rule.

At present the average Irish farmer identifies home rule with cheap land. I find the strongest advocates of home rule per se are the artisan class in towns, publicans and their assistants.

As to the papal rescript, I have not seen the general white heat indignation mentioned. True, a splitter here and there takes place, but I believe many are sincerely glad of the veto on boycotting. The plan of campaign is condemned by Mr. Dawson in his first letter as an admission of the right of landlords to exact rent, and consequently of the right to devastate the country and "spread havoc and destruction on every hand." I strongly object to the "plan" on these grounds; but once admit the ownership of the land, and it becomes robbery to hold both the land and the rent; therefore, the Roman Catholic church is bound to oppose it, or (from its own point of view) connive at fraud. Papal interference in such a matter is the natural outcome of the papal office.

THE STANDARD is invaluable. I generally send it on when read, and it is bound to make people think.

A. W. WARING.

NEW IDEAS, METHODS AND INVENTIONS.

It is well known that one of the reasons why locomotive engines are made so heavy is to increase the friction between the driving wheels and the rails; the wheels are then less liable to merely slip round without moving the train as they often do. It is now proposed by the use of an electric current to make the driving wheels take a stronger grip on the rails. This will save in power and in wear and tear and permit the use of very light engines.

Basswood may be enormously compressed, after which it may be steamed and expanded to its original volume. Advantage has been taken of this principle in the manufacture of certain kinds of moldings. The portions of the wood to be left in relief are cut out, the steam is applied to the sides of the board, then the board is planed down to a level surface, and afterward steamed. The compressed portions of the board are expanded by the steam so that they stand out in relief.

It may be asked how Americans as a rule get rich so quickly, and the question is easily answered. The whole country is ruled, governed and monopolized by moneyed combinations, syndicates and trusts. First and foremost, the country is protected. Then the capitalists join hands to fight everybody else. Then the manufacturers form a "combination." Then the merchants form a syndicate and the middle men a trust. The workman becomes a "Knight of Labor" and a sorry sort of figure but master of himself; for in spite of his every endeavor he is held down by the iron hand of tyranny. Who gets the best of all this protection? Not the working man. True, he earns \$10 or \$12 a week while his fellow laborer in England is only making 25¢, but the Englishmen is the best off at the present time.

Let me cite a case in point. A friend of the writer—an Englishman—is at present employed by a large wholesale house in this city as double entry book keeper. He is a clever accountant, quick and accurate at figures, besides being a splendid penman. The remuneration he receives is \$10 a week. A man in England—if he was badly paid—would receive say 25¢ a week for doing similar work. The Englishman would go down to the office at 8:30 or nine o'clock in the morning and would get through his work by six in the evening. He would occupy a little cottage, live comfortably, and, if he was a careful man, might enjoy life rationally. Not so the American book keeper. He must stroll down to the office at seven o'clock in the morning; if he is five minutes late he is fined ten cents (\$1); and, if it is required of him, he must work until ten or eleven o'clock at night without any extra remuneration. Now let us see how far this \$10 will go!

Rent for a room (poor one at that) ..... \$2.50  
Sewing or meals at 25¢ a day ..... 1.25  
Gas, water, lighting, etc. ..... 1.00  
Dry-goods feeding at that ..... 1.20  
Washington ..... 1.00  
Sandwiches ..... 1.00

Out of \$2.10 he must keep himself in pocket money and buy his clothes, which are double the price they are in England. He must pay ten cents (\$1) for his shoe "shining," the same amount for shaving, and twenty cents for haircutting; in short, if he had 25¢ a week in England he would be a good deal better off than he is, or possibly can be, with 40¢ here, and he would not have to work half so hard.

To those at home who have a trade, my advice is, stay where you are. To those who have no trade, but think themselves smart, the advice is the same. If they have friends here who are doing well, it makes some little difference; but I would say to them, "Don't come thinking you will earn money easily and without trouble; for if you do, just wait and you will wish yourselves back in old Bradford again."

## ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

Where is the Workman Better Off?

We find in the Bradford, England, Observer of May 26, a letter from a Bradford man who has been living in Philadelphia for three years. It will be of interest here, especially as it was evidently written without thought of political effect:

To any one who visits this country with unbounded resources, and who can view life and manners through golden spectacles, everything must seem "just lovely"; but

## CHRISTIANITY—SPIRIT AND PRACTICE.

A Short Sermon by the Rev. C. M. Moore of New Castle, 2d.

## THE PRAYER.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet and pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." (Christ.) "God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (Christ.)

Our Father—"God created man in his own image." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." "And he (God) hath made of one blood all the nations of men; for in him we live and move and have our being, for we are also his offspring."

Hallowed be thy name.—"Glory ye in his holy name." "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear."

Thy kingdom come.—"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness (doing right), and joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost." Christ is the King, man is the subject. He dwells in and rules over the heart. His kingdom is characterized by the loyalty of his subjects to his person, and by strict and unwavering obedience to his sayings—the laws that he has announced. "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them." Obedience to social custom or common usage, when contrary to the spirit of Christ's sayings, is disloyalty to the King and will be accounted as such.

They will be done on earth.—"The will of man is in opposition to the will of God. All sin, suffering and sorrow is the result of disobedience to the will of God. The petitioner is himself ready to do God's will and is eager for the time when all men shall yield reverent obedience to the heavenly Father. May all our laws, customs and thoughts be in harmony with the divine nature."

As it is in heaven.—There is no opposing will or desire in heaven, but all delight in carrying out his plans. There is no selfishness, no monopoly, no class distinction, no poverty, no sorrow, there; but, on the contrary, every son of God, forgetful of self, seeks to advance the happiness of others. The subject of God's kingdom on earth prays; or, rather, strives to bring about that the heavenly state of affairs may exist here. The believer not only wishes to secure the salvation of his soul, but he becomes a propagandist in the interest of the heavenly kingdom.

Give us this day (or day by day) our daily bread.—We will be diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving thee, but will devote all our possessions to the cause of humanity. We place our trust in thee instead of in landed estates or bank accounts. We will lay up no treasures on earth, but by loyal service will seek rewards in heaven. If there is any injustice in our social system; if there is any lack of fair dealing with our fellow men; if we are making gain at the expense of others, we will give up all and follow thee, knowing that as thou didst feed thy children in the wilderness with manna from heaven, so thou wilt supply our wants. Worldly prosperity tempts us, but we desire all things to be in harmony with the eternal laws of right and justice, knowing that if men deal righteously one with another there will supply us with food and raiment. We renounce all covetousness and self-seeking and depend on thee for subsistence.

Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.—Deal with us as we deal with our fellow men. Love us as we love them. Forgive us as we forgive them. Take advantage of our weakness as we take advantage of their weakness. Make our dealings with us the basis of thy dealings with us.

And lead us not into temptation.—Direct our ways so that our eyes may not be dazzled by the glitter of wealth or our hearts inclined to possess anything that we do not earn by our own honest toil. Lead us so that we shall not be swerved from the line of loyal submission to thy will or enduring love for our fellow men. This do, and (under the golden rule) we will be careful not to place any temptation in the way of others.

But deliver us from evil.—Evil is the transgression of God's laws and the results attached. Strengthen us to resist all temptations to triumph in all tests of loyalty. Save us from poverty and misery—the results of the evil conduct of men. This do, and (under the golden rule) we will do all in our power to rescue our fellow men from temptation, oppression, injustice and sorrow.

For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.—All this prayer and submission we offer to thee, oh God, for thine is every sunlike excellence; namely, the wide kingdom of the world, the absolute power over it, and the glory of all time attributes of all thy vast monarchy, and of all its grand events and results." (Whedon.)

Amen.—So let it be. It has the entire consent of our own hearts.

"What is a church?" Let truth and reason speak:

They would reply—"The faithful, pure and meek,

From Christian folds, the one selected race,

Of all professions, and in every place."

Crabbe: *The Borough.*

The bells ring out, calling the children of God to meet in their Father's house. A long line of stately carriages assemble in front of the magnificent temple. The pews are rapidly filled with men and women attired in purple and fine linen. Dives is there, and Midas and the railroad king and the merchant prince.

They feel need of the consolations of religion. Midas has reduced the wages of his employees and they are out on a strike; Dives feels that he must evict that widow woman who has failed to pay her rent, and the railroad king and the merchant prince are nursing on the injustice of the laws that permit a legislative committee to try into the private affairs of business corporations. The wives and daughters of Midas and the other devout Christians rest in sensuous enjoyment, for there is no want of trouble to agitate their peaceful breasts, and their garments are of the costliest stuffs, made in the latest fashion.

The great organ, now soft as the murmur of a drowsy babe, now majestic as the shout of armed hosts, fills all the sacred precincts with divinest harmony. The poor widow passing by, with her hungry babe clasped to her aching heart, stops a moment as the pavement trembles under her feet to listen to the strain; the gamin, buming a ribald air, dodges the coachman's lash with many a muttered curse. Dives and Midas, with pockets filled with mortgages, strive to divert their minds from the speculative schemes by which they hope on the morrow to fleece the lambs; the choir comes to their aid; they listen with rapt attention:

Fade, fade, each earthly joy;

Jesus is mine.

Break every tender tie;

Jesus is mine.

Dark is the wilderness,

Earth has no resting place,

Jesus alone can bless;

Jesus is mine.

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

Farewell, ye dreams of night;  
Jesus is mine.  
Lost in this dimning bright;  
Jesus is mine.  
All that my soul hath tried,  
Left but a dismal void,  
Jesus has satisfied;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Then follows the prayer. The servant of the Most High, educated and set apart for the holy office, invokes the divine blessing. He pleads that God will be present in his holy temple; that grace may abound; that temporal blessings may be vouch-safed them. He asks his Father that the sins of all may be forgiven; that they may have strength to endure the many afflictions that beset them; that they may receive all spiritual enlightenment. He prays for God's blessing upon the widow and the fatherless; and as he concludes there is a murmur as of many waters, for the congregation are united with him in the effort.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen!

## THE WORD.

"Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, and that it may be for the time to come and forever and ever; that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord, which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things; speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits; get out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us. Wherefore thus saith the Holy One of Israel, because ye despise this word, and trust in oppression and perverseness, and stay thereon. Therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant."—Isa. xxxi. 13.

"Also, thou son of man, the children of thy people are saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them; for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after covetousness. And lo! thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not."—(Ezek. xxiii. 30-32.)

"We know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"—(1 John, iv. 14-17.)

**The Farmer and the Mortgage Again.**

William E. Bear in Bradstreet's.

I notice an article extracted the other day from the Chicago Tribune, entitled, "Where are the Farmers' Savings?" in which it is stated that the following estimate of farm mortgages in the western states was made "a year or so ago by Barker Harris" of Chicago, for use in the banking business:

Ohio.....\$89,000,000 Minnesota.....\$70,000,000

Illinois.....20,000,000 Nebraska.....25,000,000

Michigan.....125,000,000 Kansas.....50,000,000

Wisconsin.....100,000,000 Missouri.....100,000,000

"According to this moderate, careful estimate," says the Tribune, "the farm mortgages in the western states aggregate an amount to the tremendous sum of over \$1,200,000,000, and the interest charged cannot be less than \$90,000,000 per annum." Further on the writer says: "The farmers of the west can never get free from under the load that oppresses them without help. Under present conditions it is preposterous to suppose that they can ever meet their mortgages and free their lands. They are virtually to-day only tenants on their own farms, and with the prospects of becoming tenants in name as well as fact in the near future."

In an article on "Western Farm Mortgages" in the Farmer's Review of February 29, summarizing a great number of reports from ten states, the estimates of the percentage of farms mortgaged vary from twenty-three to fifty-nine per cent, and in five of the states the reports stating that mortgages are increasing are more numerous than those giving the opposite verdict.

**But After Abolishing the Tariff, to Abolish the Monopoly of Timber Lands Would Benefit You Much.**

The Los Angeles (Cal.) Times, a republican newspaper, says:

As a fact, the removal of the small duty of \$2 per thousand feet on lumber would benefit us very little. The ring could buy up all the mills there, and will probably do so if necessary. That, however, does not make it any more fitting for congress to be concerning itself with the protection of these men who are engaged in bleeding the people to the extent only limited by the amount of blood in the people's veins. Whatever action be taken by congress in the matter of the duty on lumber should be taken altogether irrespective of the wishes of the Pacific coast lumbermen.

They feel need of the consolations of religion. Midas has reduced the wages of his employees and they are out on a strike; Dives feels that he must evict that widow woman who has failed to pay her rent, and the railroad king and the merchant prince are nursing on the injustice of the laws that permit a legislative committee to try into the private affairs of business corporations. The wives and daughters of Midas and the other devout Christians rest in sensuous enjoyment, for there is no want of trouble to agitate their peaceful breasts, and their garments are of the costliest stuffs, made in the latest fashion.

The great organ, now soft as the murmur of a drowsy babe, now majestic as the shout of armed hosts, fills all the sacred precincts with divinest harmony. The poor widow passing by, with her hungry babe clasped to her aching heart, stops a moment as the pavement trembles under her feet to listen to the strain; the gamin, buming a ribald air, dodges the coachman's lash with many a muttered curse. Dives and Midas, with pockets filled with mortgages, strive to divert their minds from the speculative schemes by which they hope on the morrow to fleece the lambs; the choir comes to their aid; they listen with rapt attention:

Fade, fade, each earthly joy;

Jesus is mine.

Break every tender tie;

Jesus is mine.

Dark is the wilderness,

Earth has no resting place,

Jesus alone can bless;

Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Farewell, ye dreams of night;  
Jesus is mine.  
Lost in this dimning bright;  
Jesus is mine.  
All that my soul hath tried,  
Left but a dismal void,  
Jesus has satisfied;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Farewell, ye dreams of night;  
Jesus is mine.  
Lost in this dimning bright;  
Jesus is mine.  
All that my soul hath tried,  
Left but a dismal void,  
Jesus has satisfied;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Farewell, ye dreams of night;  
Jesus is mine.  
Lost in this dimning bright;  
Jesus is mine.  
All that my soul hath tried,  
Left but a dismal void,  
Jesus has satisfied;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay;  
Jesus is mine.  
Perishing things of clay,  
Born but for one brief day,  
Pass from my heart away;  
Jesus is mine.

The minister, with carefully modulated tone and oratorical effect, reads from the word of God:

Tempt not my soul away;  
Jesus is mine.  
Here would I ever stay

## CURRENT THOUGHT.

"The Coming Reign of Plenty" is the title of an essay by Prince Kropotkin in the *Nineteenth Century* for June, in which the capacity of the earth to support an indefinitely increased population is discussed, if not exhaustively, at least very fully, and with marked ability.

The prince begins by pointing out—as he has done more fully in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for April—the steadily growing and irresistible tendency of modern civilization toward decentralization. The time is passed, or nearly so, when the various nations of the earth occupied each a special field of industry; when one set of countries furnished food and raw materials, while another set were chiefly occupied in manufacturing. Though America still sends cotton to Europe, she manufactures for her own use more and more of it every year. India has become an exporter of jute fabrics, where, less than a generation ago, she sent her jute fiber round the cape to England, to be returned to her in finished manufactures. Similar industrial changes may be observed in Prussia, Germany and other countries of continental Europe.

Knowledge and invention, boldness of thought and enterprise, conquests of genius and improvements of social organization have become international growths; and no kind of progress—political, industrial, or social—can stop within political boundaries; it crosses the seas; it pierces the mountains; steppes are no obstacle to it. Knowledge and inventive powers are now so thoroughly international that if a simple newspaper paragraph announces to-morrow that the problem of storing force, of printing without inkling, or of aerial navigation, has received a practical solution in this country or elsewhere, we may feel sure that within a few weeks the same problem will be solved, almost at the same time, by a score of inventors of different nationalities. Consequently we learn that the same scientific discovery or technical invention has been made within a few days' distance, in countries thousands of miles apart; as if there were a kind of atmosphere which favors the germination of a given idea at a given moment. And such an atmosphere exists, steam, wind, and the common stock of known edge have created it. Those who dream of monopolizing technical genius are therefore like the Venetian doge of old, who failed to control the German armament, keeping secret his mischieves, but saw the Germans also come with mitrailleuses—of Russian invention and American make—and something more powerful than mechanical guns: new military tactics. The world—the wide, wide world—is now the true domain of knowledge; and if each nation displays some special capacities in some special branch, the various capacities of different nations compensate one another, and mutual services which could be derived from them would be only secondary. The fine British workmanship in mechanics, the Nantico boldness for gigantic enterprise, the French systematic mind, and the German pedagogy, are becoming international capacities. William Armstrong in his Italian workshop communicates to Italians those capacities for manufacturing huge iron masses which have been nurtured on the Tyne; the uprooted Yankee spirit of enterprise pervades the old world; the French taste for harmony becomes European; taste, and German pedagogy, inspired, I suppose, is now doing in France what it did in England. Instead of trying to keep life in the old channels, it would be better to see what the new conditions are, what duties they impose on our generation.

Clearly, for the great manufacturing nations, the question of the future is the food supply. If the food producing countries become also great manufacturing countries, if, striking the protectionist shackles from her commerce, the United States should not only produce what manufactures she needs herself, but also compete in foreign markets with the great manufacturing countries of Europe; then, beyond a doubt, these latter will find themselves compelled to rely upon their own resources for bread and meat. Great Britain now buys from foreign countries one-half the food she eats, and pays for it in manufactures. What will she do when other nations decline to buy the produce of her looms and mills? Must half her people starve? This is the question Prince Kropotkin discusses:

It is possible that the soil of the United Kingdom, which at present yields food for one-half of its inhabitants, could provide all the necessary amount and variety of food for 30,000,000 inhabitants. It covers 78,000,000 acres all told—forests, rocks, marshes and peat bogs, cities, railways and fields! The current opinion is that it by no means can; and that opinion is so inevitable that we even see a scientist, like Mr. Huxley, who is always so cautious when dealing with current opinions in science, indorse that opinion without even taking the trouble of verifying it. It is accepted as an axiom. And yet, as soon as we try to find out any argument in its favor, we discover that it has not the slightest foundation, either in fact, or in judgment upon well known facts.

Prince Kropotkin begins his demonstration by pointing out that the soil of Great Britain supports fewer inhabitants to-day than it did thirty years ago. Since 1850 the area under wheat has been reduced by 1,500,000 acres, and the crop by 40,000,000 bushels. Cultivated crops of every kind have been reduced and pasture land increased. The chief cause of the short food supply is not the increase of population.

It is chiefly the destruction, the abandonment of agriculture. Each crop requiring human labor has had increased, and one-third of the agricultural laborers have been sent away since 1850 to reinforce the ranks of the unemployed in the cities, so that, far from being over populated, the fields of Britain are starved of human labor, as James Card used to say. The British nation does not work on her own soil; she is prevented from doing so; and the world's economists complain that "the soil will not nourish its inhabitants." *Tel s'ignor, telle terre* would be the answer of the French peasants.

The prince thus compares the agriculture of Great Britain with that of Belgium:

Belgium also grows an average of 27.8-10 bushels of wheat per acre, but her wheat area is relatively twice as large as that of the United Kingdom; it covers one-eleventh part of the cultivated area, one-twelfth of the aggregate territory. Besides, Belgian cultivators on a larger scale cultivate grain, and although she keeps the same amount of cattle on the acre as the United Kingdom, her aggregate crop of cereals are five times larger with regard to the cultivated area, and seven times larger with regard to the aggregate territory. As to those who will not fail to say that the soil of Belgium is certainly more fertile than that of this country, let me repeat, in the words of Laveleye, that "only a small, or less, of the territory offers natural conditions which are favorable for agriculture;" the other half consists of a gravelly soil, or sand, "the natural sterility of which could be overcome only by heavy manuring." Man—not nature—has given to the Belgian soil its present productivity. With this soil and labor, Belgium succeeds in supplying nearly all the food of a population which is denser than that of England and Wales, and numbers 54 million to the square mile. If the exports of agricultural produce from Belgium be taken into account, we find that Laveleye's figures are still good, and that only one inhabitant out of each twenty requires imported food. But even if we double his figures, we still find that the soil of Belgium supplies with home grown food no less than 600 inhabitants per square mile.

And Belgium is moreover, a manufacturing country which exports home-made goods to the value of \$65 per head of population (I take the figures from Laveleye's figures). As to separate parts of the Belgian territory, the small and naturally unfruitful province of West Flanders not only grows the food of its 880 inhabitants on the square mile, but exports agricultural produce to the value of 25s. per head of population. And yet no one can read Laveleye's masterly work without coming to the conclusion that the Flemish agriculture would have realized still better results were it not hampered in its growth by steadily and evenly increasing of rent. In fact, of the rent being increased each nine years, most of the farmers have abstained from further improvements.

I might quote like examples from elsewhere, especially from Lombardy, without even going as far as China. But the above will be enough to caution the reader against hasty conclusions as to the impossibility of feeding 35,000,000 people from 75,000,000 acres. They also will enable me to draw the following conclusions: (1) If the rest of the United Kingdom were cultivated only as it was nine years ago, 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000, could live on home grown food; and that culture, while giving occupation to at least 50,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy home customers to the British manufacturers. (2) If the 1,500,000 acres on which wheat was grown thirty years ago—only these, and not more—were cultivated the fields are cultivated now in England under the allotment system, which gives on the average forty bushels per acre, the United Kingdom produces grain to the value of 2,000,000 inhabitants out of 35,000,000. (3) If the now cultivated area of the United Kingdom (80,000 square miles) were cultivated as the soil is cultivated on the average in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for 37,000,000 inhabitants, and it might export agricultural produce, without ceasing to manufacture, so freely as to supply all the needs of a wealthy population. And finally (4), if the population of this country can be doubled, then it would be possible for the population to feed for 100,000 inhabitants who would be cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms of this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to cultivate the meadows which at present lie almost unproductive around the big cities in the same way as the neighborhood of Paris is cultivated by the Paris marchands. All these are not fancy dreams, but more realities; nothing but modest conclusions from what we see round about us, without any allusion to the agriculture of the

over wide territories, and are thus unable to combine together for the higher achievements of civilization. We know what an amount of labor must be spent to scratch the soil with a primitive plow, to spin and weave by hand; and we know also how much less labor it costs to grow the same amount of food, weave the same cloth, with the help of modern machinery. And we see that it is infinitely easier to grow two hundred thousand pounds of food on one acre than to grow them on a hundred acres. It is all very well to imagine that when grown in the "fertile" black earth region will have one desire: that the increase of population may permit the use of the steam digger and gardening culture in the steppes; that it may permit those who are now the beasts of burden of humanity to raise their backs and to become at last men.

Prince Kropotkin writes as a socialist. He abhors the capitalist and the middleman. But he sees clearly and acknowledges that the chief reason why men stand idle and starving in England while broad fields remain untilled is because the system of private land ownership has raised a wall between men and nature's bounty. And he well deserves our thanks and our applause for the skillful manner in which he has massed facts and figures on the side of truth.

Mr. W. H. S. Aubrey, LL.D., contributes to the *Fortnightly Review* for June, an article on "Social Problems in America," which is interesting, not as a contribution to economic literature, but as illustrating of what crudity of thought and carelessness as to fact men of reputation and education can be guilty. Among the social problems which he discusses is the silver question, of which he speaks as follows:

Ten years ago certain United States senators interested in the prolific silver mines of Nevada, secured the enactment of a measure for the coining of two millions of silver dollars monthly, and for the issue of certificates for silver deposited in bulk. A market was thus found for part of their products, but the result is that this creates a demand for silver in Europe, which is import nothing whatever. She is sufficient to herself for everything save silver. Amid these varied masses, these two hundred and fifty millions, whose more descriptions would fill volumes, the tide of life flows as vigorously as in Europe. There is as much labor, as much contention, as much ambition, as much crime, as many varieties of careers, hopes, fears, and ambitions as is possible to a moneyless Indian to become vizier of a dynasty older than history, or finance minister of a new prince whose personal fortune in hard cash is double that of the late Emperor William, or abbot of a monastery richer than Glastonbury ever was, owner of an estate that covers a county, head of a firm whose transactions may vie with those of the Barings or Bleichroders. One man, Jutes, shall be named, fed and transported the army which conquered the Pusjus.

I have faulted the rest, I see. Well, I have a moment in imagination a Europe even fuller of people, but full only of brown men, and then see also this. Above this inconceivable multitude, governing all, protecting all, taxing all, rising up to call the empire "the empire" in corporation of less than fifteen hundred men, part chosen by examination, part by co-operation, who are set to govern, and who protect themselves in governing by finding pay for a minute white garrison of 65,000 men, one-fifth of the Roman legions—though the masses to be controlled are double the subjects of Rome—less that the army of Sweden, or Belgium, or Holland. That corporation and that garrison constitute the empire, and that the empire is governed through the medium of a public expense.

Successive scenes stories of the treasury and banking authorities have avowed their conviction that unless the silver coinage be suspended, commerce will be disturbed and the public credit impaired. Seeing that silver has been for some time at a discount, the practical effect is that the country at large has to suffer from the depreciation, for any one can obtain at the mint, in exchange for gold or United States bonds, silver coins at the full discount, which he can use at the pawn shop, or at the jeweler, or at the storekeeper's house in the habit of purchasing silver in this way, so as to make a profit upon their payments for wages or commodities. The system is convenient for debtors and for all who have to pay money, but it is the reverse for creditors, and for all who have money to receive. There has been the usual talk about a bi-metallic currency and a legal uniformity of standard between gold and silver, which all practical persons know to be utterly impossible.

It is to be presumed that Mr. Aubrey really believes this nonsense, and it is certain that some, at least, of the readers of the *Fortnightly* will accept it as fact upon his testimony. It does not seem to have occurred to him that if anybody who wished could get one hundred silver dollars from the treasury in exchange for seventy-eight gold dollars every gold coin in the country would be swept into the treasury vaults within less than a month.

The produce exchanges are another of Mr. Aubrey's "social problems." It seems to him a terrible and unnatural thing that any man should buy a bushel of wheat, or a barrel of petroleum, with intent to sell it again.

In the New York produce exchange alone the members buy and sell (not of course, for delivery) two bushels of wheat for every one that is grown in the country. They deal in live time the cotton crop of the entire south. Pennsylvania yields about 24,000,000 barrels of oil a year, but in New York city as much as 20,000,000 barrels are estimated to be kept in government employ on a few planters, traders and professional men far fewer than the black men in London. In a city like Benares, a stone city whose buildings rival those of Venice, a city of temples and palaces beautiful enough and original enough to be a world's wonder, yet in which no white man's brain or hand has designed or executed anything, a traveler might live a year talking only with the learned or the rich, and understanding little of official business to do, when he sees a native fair, a village in the stations placed outside the native cities it is so everywhere. There are white servants, not even grooms, no white policemen, no white postmen, no white anything. If the brown man struck for a week, the "empire" would collapse like a house of cards, and every ruling man would be a starving prisoner in his own house. He could not move or feed himself or get water. I shall not soon forget the observation of one of the keenest and most experienced of all observers who arrived during the mutiny. He said, "I am fainted, and had consented to drive my carriage to a house sixteen miles out of Calcutta. On the road, as usual, he noted everything, but at last turned to me with the question: "Where, then, are the white men?" "Nowhere" was the only possible reply; and it is true of the entire continent. This absence of white men is said to be due to climate, but even in "the hills" no one settles. Englishmen live on the salutary plains of New South Wales; Americans, who are only Englishmen dressed differently, live on the salubrious plains of Florida; Spaniards have settled as a governing caste throughout the tropical sections of the two Americas; Dutchmen dwell on Java; but the English, whatever the temptation, will not stay in India. No matter what the sacrifice, whether in money, or dignity, or pleasant occupation, an uncontrollable disgust, an overpowering sense of being aliens inexorably divided from the people of the land, comes upon them, and they glide silently away. It follows that even in the most civilized world, and particularly among nations not in proximity. The vice-roy rules for five years, and departs. The general commands for five years, and departs. The official serves thirty years, probably in ten separate countries, and departs. They are not in India one ruling man whom two generations of Indians have known as a ruling man. Of all that in Europe comes of continuance, hereditary, accumulated personal experience, or the wisdom of old age, there is nothing, not even the crowns of emperors, to be seen. In Europe no sovran ever lived or perished in his own country. All the premier or commander-in-chief ever lived six years! Yet these men, thus shifting, thus changing, do the whole work of legislating, governing, and administering, all that is done in the whole of Europe by all the sovereigns, all the statesmen, all the parliaments, all the judges, revenue boards, prefects, magistrates, tax gatherers and police officers. They are "the empire," and there is no other.

Mr. Aubrey need not have visited this country to learn that the constant sale of the same goods on the floor of an exchange is the surest preventive of that "cornering of the market" which in a previous sentence he decries. Any English mercantile man could have told him that the corn merchants of Mark lane in London buy and sell the grain product of the world half a dozen times over every year—and lucky for the bread eaters of England that they do.

Mr. Aubrey assures us that he does not write in any spirit of "mere criticism or of cynicism," and begs that his transatlantic friends will not resent "what is intended as a kind and sympathetic treatment of the subject." He need not worry himself.

Will England retain India? This is a question which Meredith Townsend asks and answers in the June issue of the *Fortnightly Review*. He does not think she will, or can; though he evidently sincerely wishes that she could. And he states the reasons for his belief in a clear, straightforward style that is very convincing.

Meredith begins with a description of the British empire in India that perhaps conveys a clearer idea of what the British domination really means than has ever before been given.

It is customary with Englishmen, and especially with Englishmen who have seen India, to speak of the British domination as "a miracle," but they seldom realize fully the import of their words. The Indian empire is not a miracle in the rhetorician's sense. It is a thing which existed and is alive, but cannot be accounted for by any process of reasoning founded on experience. It is a thing which, as a floating island of granite would be a miracle, or a bird of brass which flew and sang and lived on in midair. It is a structure built on nothing, without foundations, without buttresses, held in place by some force the origin of which is undiscoverable and the nature of which has never been explained. For eighty years at least writers by the score have endeavored to bring home to Englishmen the nature of India, but so far as can be perceived they have failed. The British renders what they say, learn by the ligures, tries to understand their description, fails, for all his labor, to realize what India is—a continent larger as Europe west of the Vistula, and with 30,000,000 more people, fuller of ancient nations, of great cities, of varieties of civilization, of armies, nobilities, priesthoods, organizations for every conceivable purpose from the spreading of great religions down to systematic murder. There are twice as many Bengalees as there are Frenchmen, the Hindostanis, properly so called, outnumber the whites in the United States; the Maharratis would fill Spain, the people of the

Punjab with Scinde are double the population of Turkey, and I have named but four of the more salient divisions. Everything is on the same bewildering scale. The fighting peoples of India, whose males are as big as ourselves, as brave as ourselves, and more regardless of death than ourselves, number at least a hundred and twenty millions, according to Gibbon's calculation of the population of the Roman empire. There are four hundred thousand trained brown soldiers in native service, of whom we hear perhaps once in ten years, and at least two millions of men who think their proper profession is arms, who would live by arms if they could, and of whom we in England never hear a word. If the Prussian conscription were applied in India we should, without counting reserves or landwehr, or any force not summoned in time of peace, have two and a half millions of soldiers actually in barracks, with eight hundred thousand recruits ready to go to the front, and the world might be troubled. There are tons of millions of prosperous peasants whose hoardings make of India the grand absorber of the precious metals; tens of millions of peasants beside whose poverty fellahs or Sicilians or Connacht men are rich; millions of artisans ranging from the men who build palaces to the men who, nearly naked and almost without tools, do the humblest work of the potter. Every occupation which exists in Europe exists also in India. The industry of the vast continent continues, for India, with her position in the world, might be reduced. There are tons of millions of peasants whose hoardings make of India the grand absorber of the precious metals; tens of millions of peasants beside whose poverty fellahs or Sicilians or Connacht men are rich; millions of artisans ranging from the men who build palaces to the men who, nearly naked and almost without tools, do the humblest work of the potter. Every occupation which exists in Europe exists also in India. The industry of the vast continent continues, for India, with her position in the world, might be reduced.

Such a description of India as this renders the rest of Mr. Townsend's somewhat lengthy article almost unnecessary. English domination is simply a dead weight imposed upon a social system which it has done much indeed to repress, but nothing to modify. Over all India England has enforced what Mr. Townsend terms the *pax Britannica*—the universal peace. No native ruler may wear upon his neighbor; organized brigandage and organized murder have been put down, and kept down, with the strong hand; civil justice is open to all—who can afford to pay for it; the crushing heavy taxes are impartially collected; and there is absolute freedom of religion. And yet Mr. Townsend, who writes as though he knew, believes that these blessings are utterly unappreciated by the people on whom they have been conferred:

Personal liberty, religious liberty, equal justice, perfect security—these things the empire gives; but, then, are these so valued as to overcome the inherent and incurable dull distaste felt by the brown men to the white men who give them? I doubt it greatly. The immense mass of the peasantry, who benefit most directly by the British ways of ruling, are, it must be remembered, an inert mass. They are the slaves of the gentry, not the players. To the right of the *pax Britannica* there is that all Indian revolutions, wars, invasions, movements of all kinds, have occurred. Lost in the peaceful monotony of their village life, which, unless all evidence from history is worthless, they most heartily love, they hardly notice dynastic changes, and will accept any ruler if only he leaves their customs alone, and takes no more of their produce than they have been accustomed to pay to the strong. Even, therefore, if they approved the British government, their approval would be of little political value, but there is no evidence that they do approve it.

Of all the active classes of India, the one which the English treated best were the Sepoys, the Hindostane and Benarese peasants who, for a hundred years had followed the British standard in career of victory broken only once. Alone among the soldiers of the world, these men not only entered the service of their own free will, but were authorized to quit it at their own discretion. They could not be sent abroad without their own consent, and could not be compelled to serve in distant lands. Their discipline was so mild that it rather resembled that of policemen than that of soldiers, and was, in particular, wholly devoid of that element of worry which is the true grievance of English soldiers when not in the field. They were paid wages just double those obtainable in civil life, had many prizes of the shape of promotion, and received their pensions as regularly as dividends on state bonds. Their farms, even in native states, were specially protected, and the magistrates under whom they labored received a salary which was double that of the Sepoys. Even the customary hantour of the European disappeared in favor of the Sepoys. Their officers liked and petted them, and so represented any asperion on them as to impair, sometimes seriously, the necessary freedom of inspecting generals. The Sepoys never pretended to have grievances; for the greatest cartridge story was an invention, dropped when the mutiny exploded, and the intercepted letters spoke only of the fewness of the white. Yet the Sepoys were not mutinous, but slaughtered our officers whom individually they liked, and even in many instances massacred our women and children, and fought us for two years with a fury which made compromise impossible. Why? Because they were Asiatics, filled with the dull, unconquerable, unmalleable obstinacy of Asiatics for white men, and thought they saw a chance of getting rid of them. The white troops, they said, were few, and the black grunts many, and they shook the sieve that the white grunts were English. The greater the war, the more the mutiny, but a revolt, which the armed classes, as was natural, took the leading share. The proclamation of the effete dynasty at Delhi—a proclamation accepted by Hindus as well as Mussulmen—showed its true object, which was to restore the India which had been before the arrival of Europeans. The authority was replaced, and it is the specialty of the mutiny, among revolts, that no new sovereign or commander-in-chief was named. The history of the mutiny, carefully studied, is, to my mind, irresistible evidence of Indian dislike to white rule.

As for the higher classes, it would be a wonder indeed if they endured the British yoke with patience. For British domination reduces them to insignificance and inaction, and makes them followers, when they feel that of right they should be leaders. They have their great possessions still—their treasures and their troops; but the heavy restraining of the empire is on them, and forces them to sit in idleness, when they would fain be up and doing.

To such a state of things there can be but one end, and Mr. Townsend points it out very plainly. Let England sustain one heavy defeat outside India—an defeat heavy enough to forbid her reinforcing the little band of white men that now hold India under their feet—and the British Indian empire will be at an end. How soon it will come, Mr. Townsend does not pretend to guess; but that it will come sooner or later he is resignedly confident. And if things are as he describes them, it would be hard to contradict his prophecy.

CHARLES B. SCHAUER, PHOTOGRAPHER, 220 Third Avenue, cor. 28th street.

Children's Photographs by instantaneous process.

CHARLES B. SCHAUER, PHOTOGRAPHER, 220 Third Avenue, cor. 28th street.

Children's Photographs by instantaneous process.

CHARLES B. SCHAUER, PHOTOGRAPHER, 220 Third Avenue, cor. 28th street.

Children's Photographs by instantaneous process.

CHARLES B. SCHAUER, PHOTOGRAPHER, 220 Third Avenue, cor. 28th street.